

THE  
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

APRIL, 1871.

---

ART. I.—SCHLEIERMACHER AND THE THEOLOGY OF THE  
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

BY REV. WM. M. REILY, A. M., JONESTOWN, PA.

A THEOLOGICAL Review, if it is to carry with it any weight and significance, must represent some particular form of Church life. At the same time it must give forth no uncertain sound in the statement of its position; and in the vindication of it must be able to show good reason why its type of theological thought can justly claim the attentive regard of the religious world.

In the utterance of its principles, no one can charge the MERCERSBURG REVIEW, with the employment of ambiguous terms. It must be conceded, that there is much matter to be found in its pages, which is not at once comprehensible to the mass of theological inquirers. It does not despise the mystical element in the sphere of divinity; nor does it attach great weight to the attribute, which, according to some, is the chief merit of all composition, that, viz., of being easily understood. Still any one, possessing ordinary intellectual ability, if he has the honest desire, may acquaint himself with the distinctive features of the school from which it emanates, with whose growth it is part and parcel, and which it continues to represent.

As it has been distinct in the statement of its position, it has been no less firm and confident in the presentation of the grounds upon which it is based. These centre in the claims of history, as a divine, living and moving power, to be listened to as an authoritative instructor of mankind. Facts and doctrines which in the early ages were adhered to and insisted upon by the Church, as essential to its life and conditioning its existence, the REVIEW regards as divine and sacred truth. If the Christian Church is to accomplish its mission and realize the idea of its Founder in calling it into existence, it must be true to itself; and hence what corresponds with the original consciousness of the Church, as for instance, what is expressed in the Apostles' Creed, is most likely to correspond with the idea of Christianity. So much importance has the REVIEW attached to the testimony of the early Church in favor of its position, that it has been charged with being "engaged in a bootless attempt to make humanity perform a crab-like pilgrimage into medieval and patristic darkness," and its contributors with "having closed their own shutters, lighted their candles, and made the hands of their own clocks point as many centuries as possible back."

But we maintain, that no Review has been more wakeful in watching the progress, which theological science has been making in recent times, at home or abroad. And whilst it boasts the Fathers as authority for its position, with none the less emphasis does it quote modern testimony of almost equal respectability to prove the closeness of the correspondence of its position with the idea of Christianity. Whither shall we look for more reliable witnesses on a point of this kind than to Germany? Grave defects, it is true, may be pointed out in the character of German thinking; but it is, nevertheless, an undeniable fact that German thinkers have spent more honest, independent, persevering and successful labor in the advancement of theological science, than any other class of modern divines. At their head stands Schleiermacher. The Germans regard him as the first of theologians. Not perhaps so grave and judicious as Augustine, nor possessed of as much vigor and tact as Calvin, but as

regards originality and profundity, candid and competent judges concede that he is superior to both. So original is he in his investigations that he deserves, as none other does, to be called a pioneer in the sphere of religious thought; and in the majestic movement of his theological system he appears to be absolutely untrammelled by his surroundings, and to be governed only by the idea of Christianity as it took possession of his own inner being. This independency of course is conditioned on the one hand by the peculiar intellectual status in which Christianity finds him; but on the other it is controlled by such a depth of insight, keen discernment and philosophical penetration as has seldom been brought to bear upon any subject. Christianity for him is a living fact. Standing forth as a reality for his faith and a power exerting its forces upon his spiritual nature, he applies his gigantic intellect to the discovery of the metaphysical principles lying back of it, its inner structure and its bearings. And no one has ever been more successful in bringing to the light the philosophical ideas which lie hidden under the facts of the Gospel, nor in setting these forth, in such a way that their harmony with each other appears, and as a totality, their adaptedness to the necessities of our nature.

Considered by himself therefore Schleiermacher stands forth as most respectable theological authority. But for our purpose he is emphatically such, viewed as a representative man. It is in his person that the greatest stride has been taken in the development of modern theology. In Germany, it must be conceded, is to be found the central channel in which the movement of Protestant life and thought is going forward; and all are aware that the display of scientific brilliance which is presented by the theological faculties of the universities of that land can be understood only under the light of that great teacher whom such men as Nitzsch, Twisten, Dorner, Tholuck, Müller, and Lange, have in mind when they say to their attendants *da magistrum*.

In adducing Schleiermacher as a witness on the side of the REVIEW, no one at all acquainted with the facts in the case would for a moment suppose that we are about to undertake to show that his system is identical with the so called Mercers-

burg theology. In many respects there is a world-wide difference between the two. When we take into consideration his previous life and history, which was in a great measure, a living in of the rationalistic and pantheistic systems of that period, it is nothing more than natural to expect to find much in his exposition of Christian doctrine which must appear as excrescences here, and as having its roots only in what went before. To suppose him thus breaking with his inner past, and then as soon as the living idea of Christianity bursts upon his view, to suppose him capable of developing a system which would harmonize in all its ramifications with what might be regarded as the spirit of a pure Christianity, would be to suppose nothing less than a stupendous intellectual miracle. Schleiermacher errs equally in the direction of a false naturalism and a false spiritualism. It is a well-known fact that the Unitarians of this country claim him as an advocate of their system, and taking his statements on the subject by themselves there is only too good ground for the assumption. When we hear him speaking on certain eschatological topics, with equal reason we might give him over to the Universalists, whilst his doctrine of Inspiration many might regard as striking at the vitals of the Christian faith. But the modern so-called Evangelical opponents of the REVIEW could find just as much in this great teacher to substantiate their peculiar views. In the matter of man's salvation, he ascribes the preponderating importance to the word as over against the sacraments. The part which he assigns to the feelings in regeneration and conversion would suit their taste exactly. Whilst again some of his class would say that he drives the matter a little too far when he expresses himself as follows: "Accordingly it would have been perfectly proper at the time of the Reformation, in order to get back again to the original institution of Christ to let infant Baptism drop, and we could still do it. . . . And just as well could we abandon the usage without detriment to our children."\*

Here some of our readers will be inclined to say, "After such a diversified catalogue of opinions as this, surely it is not im-

---

\* Glaubenslehre, § 135, 2.



probable that Mercersburg could find something in its favor in the system of Schleiermacher." In proceeding to show to what extent it does so, we wish to have observed a distinction between an individual's own views on separate features of the Christian Redemption, and his conception of it as a whole, taken together with what such a conception requires. It cannot be otherwise, as already stated than that in the evolution of this idea of Christianity, much would be introduced which belonged to his previous history, and in so far remain, at least in a measure, uninfluenced by it. But what is the manner in which he regards Christianity as such? This is the point which first of all should be ascertained, for this, must of course lie at the basis of his entire presentation of Christian doctrine.

It is true that Schleiermacher does, what Dr. Dörner says every Protestant theologian ought to, viz., concede that the material principle of Protestantism must exert a controlling influence upon the statement and arrangement of doctrines in the formation of a system. He goes so far as to say, in his introduction to the *Glaubenslehre* that the idea to which Protestantism owes its existence must modify the entire teaching of the Church so far as it prevailed up to that period. And of course the individual theologian must give it a ruling significance, if his exhibition is to prove answerable to the demands of the community for whom it is intended, and whose position it aims to set forth. Be this as it may, Christianity forces itself upon his view as having its ground in the person of Christ, and it is from the standpoint of Christ's person, that all connected with the Christian Redemption is contemplated. If there is any merit commonly ascribed to Schleiermacher at all, it is that of bringing about a just apprehension of the central significance of Christ's person in the economy of grace. The union of the divine and human in the act of the incarnation is the point from which and back to which every thing is made to move. The following passage on this point may suffice. "It is only by the way that we can here in advance direct attention to the influence which the conception of the archetypal character (*Urbildlichkeit*) of Christ in the perfect natural historicalness of His

life and career exerts upon all the doctrines prevailing in the Church, all of which as soon as this is more or less abandoned, must assume a different form. For the fact that all doctrines and precepts which develop themselves in the Christian Church are universally concurred in, owing exclusively to this that they are to be traced back to Christ, is to be ascribed only to this perfect archetypal character pertaining to all things standing in connection with the power of the God-consciousness."\*

This point of view is by no means one upon which Schleiermacher accidentally stumbled in handling the matter before him. Nor is it one arbitrarily chosen from a number of others which possibly might have answered the purpose just as well. But he feels that this is forced upon him as soon as he stands face to face with the objective fact of Redemption. He sees at once that this is the only normal way of looking at the subject. And hence the order in which he places the movement of salvation is that of the Creed. It is a significant fact that the doctrine of the Trinity is treated at the conclusion of his dogmatics. The reason for this he gives in the very first sentence. He tells us that "essential to a scientific exposition of this subject is a previous unfolding of the doctrine of the union of the Divine Being with the nature of man, as it holds both in the personality of Christ and the Holy Ghost as the animating Spirit of the Church, with which the entire conception of Christianity in our Church doctrine stands or falls. For without assuming an *esse Dei* in Christ, the idea of redemption could not in this way be concentrated (concentrirt werden) in His person."† The coming of the Holy Ghost is viewed as organically connected with the coming of Christ, and the fact of the Church as flowing necessarily from both. The forgiveness of sins is something of which Schleiermacher seems to know nothing except in so far as it holds in, and transpires through, the Church. Whilst for him, outside of Christ and the work of Redemption, the immortality of the soul is emphatically little more than a mythological dream.

---

\* Glaubensl. §. 93, 5.

† Glaubensl. § 170, 1.

Hand in hand with what has been said goes the fact that Schleiermacher views Christianity as a divine principle taking hold of the world's life and developing itself in a historical way. His system might be called an embodiment of this conception. To adduce all the passages which bear us out in this statement would be to transcribe the work itself; for the historical idea not only comes up expressly in almost every chapter, but it is everywhere presupposed. For the present on this point a single short passage will suffice: "Although the Second Adam has not His origin in the former order of life, but stands related to it as a supernatural Being, still He is brought like a single individual into connection with the order of history, and stands with all His activity and efficiency under the law of historical development which is carried forward and completes itself by gradually spreading over the whole from the one point of His manifestation."\*

The essential characteristics of the position of the REVIEW are summed up in what we have just represented Schleiermacher as teaching. These too are fundamental views in the system of the great theologian. Before passing over to consider his treatment of separate points of doctrine, it may be well here to make a few more extended quotations in order to show fully that this is correct.

The *Glaubenslehre* embraces two volumes, of which the second is much the larger. About one-third of the first is devoted to the introduction, after which are treated Theology proper and the doctrine of Sin. The second volume is devoted to the subject of Grace or Redemption, including Soteriology and the doctrine of the Last Things. This general subject of the second volume is prefaced by five theses, with observations under each, which go to pave the way or lay the foundation, for what is to follow. Two of these theses we will quote, with a few passages from the observations under each.

§ 87. "We are conscious of all the approaches to the condition of blessedness occurring in the Christian life as origina-

---

\* § 89, 2.

ting in a new divinely-wrought order of organic life,\* which operates in the way of counteraction against the sinful order of organic life and the woe which in it is developed." From Obs. 3. "It might be said that the thesis implies a difference between the commencement of the growing blessedness in the Christian community at any particular time, and that proceeding immediately from Christ Himself (as was the case with the first believers). But this is by no means the case. For to regard this new organic order of existence as something divinely wrought, is the same as tracing it back to Christ as one divinely given; and precisely so, originally to believe that Jesus is the Messiah was the same as believing that the kingdom of God, viz., the new order of existence to be wrought by God, is come, and accordingly at that time salvation as it was coming to pass had its ground in the same. Nor can any one regard the thesis as approaching Roman Catholic doctrine in that the change in the personal condition is ascribed as it were immediately to the community. To what extent the Roman view is contradicted will appear when we come to describe on the one hand the process in the individual and on the other the character of the community. The thesis in general however may be applied to Christianity viewed from the most varied stand-point. But two things it does certainly exclude. The first is that there can be any participation in the Redemption through Christ outside of the community (or organic life order) by Him established, as though the Christian could dispense with the latter and be as it were with Christ alone. Such separation as this we pronounce fanatical because it sets aside the fact that the originally divinely-wrought can only be apprehended as something historically appearing, and only in its character as historical can it work on; and consequently as it can only in solitary instances arise, it must also sooner or later disappear. But we further say that it destroys the essence of Christianity, inasmuch as it postulates an activity of Christ without such mediation as the conditions of our existence in space and time

---

\* The German word is *Gesamtleben*, which in some connections we translate community.

require; it must accordingly so isolate itself that there can be no such thing as an overworking of what by itself was effected. The other thing that is excluded is the assumption that independently of such an interposition and with the Adamatic order some individuals, though they be the very best, could attain to a condition approaching salvation."

§ 88. "In this community which owes its existence to the activity of Christ, Redemption through Him is effected through the impartation of His sinless perfection." From Obs. 2. "Accordingly the establishment of the new order of life is not a separate act without which that distinguishing peculiarity (His sinless perfection) could have been in Jesus; but as this could only appear as deed, so the other only as its essential work. The faith of later generations, our own of course included, must be the same with that of the original believers and not another; for if it were another not only would the unity of the Christian Church be endangered, but there could hardly any longer be an appeal to the original testimonies of faith. Accordingly the same experience must be produced now which existed then, and the recognition of Christ's sinless perfection urging decidedly toward the new community must likewise be His work. But instead of His personal activity we have only that of His community, in so far as it can also be said that the image given us of Him in the Scriptures owes its origin and continued existence to it. Our thesis thus goes upon the supposition that this agency (*Wirkung*) of the community in calling forth faith, is nothing more than the effect (*Wirkung*) of the sinless perfection of Christ Himself."

There certainly appears to be a decided resemblance between Schleiermacher's conception of Christianity and that of the REVIEW. To such an extent is this the case according to the representations made, that it might be said that our task requires nothing more of us, for it is plain that according to his testimony the REVIEW is not far out of the way, in what pertains to the true idea of the Christian religion. In order however to show that there is more than appearance in this correspondence, we must go further and inquire how this general view of

the subject is reflected in the particular features of the theological system. A few of the more important of these will now be glanced at; and for the sake of convenience we will begin with the doctrine of the

#### SACRED SCRIPTURES.

This is a subject which the REVIEW has been constrained to look upon in a light different from that in which the large proportion of Protestant divines view it. Not that any one has ever been charged with attaching too much importance to the Bible, but that its legitimate position in the economy of redemption has not been assigned it. There are features here to which it is subordinate, and those with which it is co-ordinate. Now to put it on an equality with the former, and elevate it above the latter, is to damage the cause of truth. The revelation of God in the person of His Son is surely a fact which is in no wise conditioned by the Scriptures, but on the contrary they are conditioned by it. Who will deny that they owe their existence to it? As to the relation between the Church and the Scriptures it might be said that they mutually condition each other. But as they stand related to that which is central, viz., the appearance of Christ, it is plain that the Church comes first and the Scriptures afterward. There might have been a Church without the New Testament writings (but how long it would have existed we do not pretend to say) but there could have been no New Testament without a Church already at hand. Accordingly we hear Schleiermacher saying in the last quotation made that the image of Christ as it is presented in the Scriptures, owes its origin and preservation to the Church; and in another place he expresses the same idea, when he says that the composition of the several books and their collection into a whole is the work of the Holy Ghost as the animating Spirit (*Gemeingeist*) of the Christian community. His conception of Christianity does not permit this subject to come up until the doctrine of the Church is reached; and here it is treated as co-ordinate with that of the Sacraments. In section 128 he tells us that no man is led to believe in Christ by belief in the Scriptures, but before he can believe in the Scriptures he must first believe in Christ. On this subject he reasons as

follows: If a man believes in the Bible before he believes in Christ, its truth must have been demonstrated to him by a logical series based on reason. Those only then could be said to have a legitimate faith who possessed sufficient intellectual power duly to weigh and appreciate the force of the arguments. The faith of simple-minded believers accordingly would not deserve the name, for it rests mechanically upon a foreign authority. The activity of the Church in other forms, according to Schleiermacher, is always pre-supposed before the believer comes to regard the inspired Word in its true character. Further light is thrown upon the subject by the distinction which he makes between the constitutive and critical normal dignity of the Bible. The latter is the one which persons prevailingly have in mind when speaking of the divine Word as a rule of faith. But its critical efficiency he regards as only subordinate to, and scarcely more than a shadow of the constitutive. What he means by this is that in the Church the Scriptures are the regulating type of all productivity in the sphere of thought. "So that by the use of them the Holy Spirit can lead us into all truth just as the Apostles themselves and others were thus led, who enjoyed the immediate instructions of Christ; and thus when at some future time there will be at hand in the Church a perfect reflection of the living God-knowledge of Christ, we will rightly regard this as the fruit of the Scriptures, without anything originally foreign to them being added. But of course that must be ascribed to them which is directly the effect of what was brought about by them."\*

#### THE INCARNATION.

The REVIEW from the beginning has insisted upon it, that a radical defect in the reigning modern theological thinking is the false position in which the Incarnation is placed in the work of man's salvation. It is not a mere *sine qua non*, a secondary feature or stepping-stone to some mediatorial activity of primal significance. On the contrary it is the central point in the

---

\* § 131, 2.



economy of grace as it is in the history of our race. As has already been said, so soon as Schleiermacher is led to contemplate Christianity in its true character as an objective historical fact, he cannot but regard it as a new order of life having its origin in the Incarnation, and as being throughout conditioned and characterized by this fundamental fact. Accordingly he tells us that the Flesh-becoming of the Logos is for the race what Regeneration is for the individual,\* and that Redemption is nothing more than the evolution of the divine life-principle which was implanted into humanity when the Deity assumed human nature in the person of Christ. "All the activity of our Saviour proceeds from the *esse Dei* in Him. And in the origination of His person the Divine creative activity which confirmed itself in Him as the *esse Dei*, was alone active. Hence all the activity of our Saviour may be regarded as a continuation of this divine person-forming influence upon human nature. For the permeating activity of Christ cannot confirm itself in an individual without becoming person-forming in him, inasmuch all his activities are modified, and all his impressions influenced, by what Christ has wrought in him, so that it can no longer be said that his personal self-consciousness is the same. And just as the creation does not aim at the individual, as though each creation of an individual were a particular act, but the world was made, and every particular thing and person as such only in and with the whole, and just as good for that which is not itself as for itself: so is the activity of Christ world-forming, and its object is human nature, into which as a totality the strongest God-consciousness is to be implanted as a new divine life-principle; individuals, however, He appropriates in reference to the totality, as He finds those in whom His activity can not only remain, but from and through whom by means of the manifestation of His life it can reach others. And thus the entire activity and efficiency of Christ is but the con-

---

\* \* Denn wie der Eintritt Christi in die Menschheit die zweite Schöpfung derselbe ist, sie also dadurch eine neue Kreatur wird, so kann man diesen Eintritt auch als die Wiedergeburt des menschlichen Geschlechts ansehen, welche aber doch nur unter der Form der Wiedergeburt der Einzelnen wirklich zu Stande kommt. § 106, 2.

tinuation of that creative divine activity in which the person of Christ originated."\*

#### THE MYSTICAL UNION.

In defining the relation of the believer to Christ the REVIEW has employed terms which have been denounced as mystical. Such expressions as "engrafted or implanted into Christ," and "entering into a life-union with Him," are frequently used to designate the one-ness of the believer with his Lord. The REVIEW holds this to be of an organic character; and it has been found fault with on the one hand by those who believe in merely a moral union, such *e. g.* as the teacher sustains to the pupil, and on the other by those who advocate an outward representative theory according to which the believer's salvation consists, chiefly in a mechanical imputation of Christ's merits, in other words, in a forensic justification. Over against a rationalistic and a false supernaturalistic view of the subject, Schleiermacher expresses himself as follows: "Whilst now this mystical conception can be proven to be the legitimate one and that of the early Church, it claims also to be the true mean between two others of which one I would designate as the magical and the other the empirical. Those holding the former concede that the activity of Christ is redemptive in its character, but they deny that the impartation of Christ's perfection is dependent upon the establishment of a community, and say it is effected through His immediate influence upon the individual. Some make the written word an essential condition, and in the case of these the magical becomes more distinct in proportion as they repudiate everything that has its origin in the community. The magical now consists in an influence which is not mediated by anything natural yet ascribed to an individual. It contradicts thus the maxim which lies at the foundation of this work, viz., that whilst the commencement of the Kingdom of God is supernatural, it becomes natural in so far as it enters the sphere of phenomena; for at every stage of its movement the supernatural element is supposed to be at hand. This view is

\* § 100, 2.

further separatistic in the extreme, and docetic. The former, for according to it the institution of the community appear to be something purely accidental; the latter because if it were possible that Christ could carry on the work of redemption by being in no sense present on the earth but solely and absolutely in Heaven, He could always have operated in this way, and His personally appearing actually in the flesh would have to be regarded as unnecessary and hence superfluous. The opposite, viz., the empirical conception adheres to a redemptive activity of Christ which consists however in a bringing about an advancing degree of moral and spiritual perfection by means of His teaching and example."\* "Those conceptions of the atoning activity of Christ may be regarded as magical which make the impartation of Christ's blessedness independent of being received into a life-communion with Him. Here the forgiveness of sin is ascribed to the punishment which Christ endured, and the salvation of man represented as a reward which God extends to Christ for the suffering of such penalty. Of course we do not pretend to say that the thought is entirely to be rejected that our salvation is a rewarding of Christ, of which more will hereafter be said; nor as little that all connection between the suffering of Christ and the forgiveness of sins is to be denied: but both are magical so soon as they cease to be mediated by a life-communion with Christ."†

#### THE CHURCH.

The REVIEW has always maintained, as the Creed plainly indicates, that the Church is a constituent element in the economy of Redemption. Of course there are no thinking persons who would deny that Christianity could go forward without something at least answerable to the idea of an ecclesiastical organization. The Scriptures for example had to be gathered, and they are still to be preserved, and their contents more and more unfolded. This presupposes at least what might be called a communion of activity. But there are many who go further and

---

\* § 100, 3.

† § 101, 3.

say that the Church is the vehicle of Redemption,\* but only in the sense of a mechanical appliance to which divine wisdom saw fit to resort in the realization of the primary decree of men's salvation. But according to the REVIEW it is a part and parcel of the work from beginning to end, and in the divine mind the Church and Redemption are one and the same, and in temporal reality they are but the two sides from which the one grand fact may be viewed. In his views on this subject Schleiermacher does not shrink from such conclusions as are required by his conception of historical Christianity and the union of the divine and human in the person of Christ. He hesitates not to say that it is only in the communion of saints that faith appropriates the blessings of Christ's salvation, just as this is the legitimate sphere of that activity for the glory of God and the welfare of men which is the fruits of such redemption.† But he goes further and adds to the statement that salvation is in the Church alone, this, that the Church alone saves.‡ In what sense now he wishes this to be understood will appear from the following passage, in which he speaks of the relation of Christ to the Church. "On the one hand as His organism—which is meant in the Scriptures when it is called the body of Christ—it stands related to Him as the external to the internal, and accordingly it must in its essential activities be an adumbration of those of Christ. And inasmuch that which is accomplished by it is nothing else than the progressive realization of Christ's redemption in the world, its activities must be the continuations of those of Christ.§ What was said in reference to the histori-

---

\* Und wäre nicht eine solche Vereinigung (des göttlichen Wesens mit der menschlichen Natur), so könnte auch diese die Kirche nicht auf solche Weise der Träger und Fortbeweger der Erlösung durch Christum sein. § 170, 1.

† Der Glaube als Zustand der Einzelnen in ist jene Aneignung (der Vollkommenheit und Seligkeit Christi), aber es giebt so wie eine Wirkankert der angeeigneten Vollkommenheit Christi so auch einen Genuss der angeeigneten Seligkeit Christi nur in der Gemeinschaft der Gläubigen. § 137, 2.

‡ So dass schon hier der Satz, dass in der Kirche allein Seligkeit ist, und weil diese nicht von aussen hineingekommen sondern nur darin sein kann insofern sie darin hervorgebracht wird, dass die Kirche allein selig macht, niemand ueberraschen kann. § 113, 3.

§ § 127, 3.

cal conception may be repeated in regard to the Churchly, viz. that Schleiermacher's system is the embodiment of it. In the soteriological division it is omnipresent, his entire discussion of the Last Things is based upon it, and the subject of grace as a whole, including the two last mentioned, is closed with the following significant sentence: "The world can be regarded as the perfect revelation of Divine wisdom, only in so far as the Holy Spirit from within the Christian Church makes itself realized as the final world-forming power."\*

#### THE SACRAMENTS.

We have now reached a point touching which it might be supposed that the high position of the REVIEW could find no support in the teachings of Schleiermacher. It must be conceded that here as elsewhere we find much in him which we cannot endorse, and perhaps the very lowest of low Churchmen might be able to come away, satisfied upon the whole, from a perusal of the great divine's chapters on the subject. But his conception of Christianity as a whole being such as we have indicated, he cannot avoid such statements as most strikingly accord, with the view which in these pages has been represented as the only legitimate one, as being the doctrine of the Church. We quote two passages. "Nothing more is to be expected in the way of an immediate personal influence from Christ; accordingly the formation and renewal of the life-communion with Christ must proceed from the Church and rest upon its ordinances, but however only upon such as can be regarded at the same time as activities of Christ, so that Christ is not made to assume a passive relation in the connection and over against the Church to stand in the back-ground. For although Baptism, according to the original institution, is not the absolute beginning of the relation between the Church and the individual; still everything going before receives in it, its confirmation in such a way that the regularity of the conscious life-communion with Christ properly begins with it. And notwithstanding the

---

\* § 169, 3.

Lord's Supper is not the only means of supporting the life-  
communion with Christ, and although in these preliminary re-  
marks we are not permitted to regard it as a ceremony which  
may be isolated, and to which a definite effect can be ascribed ;  
still we put it down as the highest of its class, and view all  
other participation of Christ as subordinate, either as approach-  
ing to it or continuing from it.\* "What is common to the Sacra-  
ments is this, that they are continued operations of Christ, hid-  
den in, and most closely bound up, with transactions of the  
Church, by means of which He exercises His sacerdotal activity  
upon the individual, and supports and perpetuates that life-  
communion between Himself and us in virtue of which alone  
God regards us in Christ."†

In conclusion we repeat what we said in the beginning and  
what we hope has all along been understood, that we quote  
Schleiermacher not as one who stands in full sympathy with  
the theology of the MERCERSBURG REVIEW, but rather as out-  
side testimony, viz. as a philosopher candid and sincere, who  
makes earnest with the most vital of problems pertaining to the  
welfare of the race. We find in him, it is true, not only much  
that is at variance with legitimate Church teaching, but errors  
which seem to lead him along the very abyss of unbelief. If,  
however, we ask him what he conceives Christianity essentially  
to be, he answers; that which it originally assumed to be, as it  
presented itself in the person of its Founder to the view of the  
believing world: which now it will have itself regarded as being  
as it stands forth challenging the confidence of mankind; and  
which as a perennial fact looking to the redemption of the race,  
it must ever be conceived to be, viz. a supernatural fact starting  
in the union of Deity and humanity as this took place in the  
Incarnation, carried forward according to the law of historical de-  
velopment on the broad bosom of the Church, and made effectual  
for the individual through the communication of the life of the  
God-man by means of the preaching of the Word and adminis-  
tration of the Sacraments: a fact with which we can come into

---

\* § 143, 2. † *Ib.*

full and effectual contact only when it is apprehended in that spirit in which he himself sought to approach it, which is expressed in the well-known words of Anselm, quoted as a motto on the title page of the Glaubenslehre: *Neque enim quæro intellegere ut credam, sed credo ut intelligam. Nam qui non crediderit, non experietur, et qui expertus non fuerit, non intelliget.*

---

## ART. II.—THE AMERICAN COLLEGE ON THE DEFENSIVE.

---

BY LEWIS H. STEINER, FREDERICK CITY, MD.

---

PRESIDENT STEARNS of Amherst College is reported to have said, in his address at the dedication of Walker Hall, "The College aims to develop an educated, a completed and Christian manhood. It does not make professional men, but scholarly men." This definition of the province and aim of the American College, we accept as embodying all that could be reasonably demanded of such an institution, being at the same time fully conscious that it does not accord with the prevailing popular idea, which may be thus stated: "The college should furnish a youth with all such information as may be of *practical* importance to him in after life, and with nothing that can not be converted into money when he gets out into the world; it should make him not a scholar, but a business man." The utilitarian character of the age is not sufficiently far-sighted to see that whatever develops the whole man must in the end be the best education for the youth, that no man can certainly succeed, even in the race for wealth or honor, unless he shall have that mental training which will enable him to take something more than a superficial view of the subjects that appertain to his calling,—that where success has been secured without such training it has been exceptional and not in accordance with the rule. Our restless spirit is impatient of all that savors of training. The boy tolerates but poorly the restraints of his



parents or guardians; the pupil cares but little for the principles which underlie the rule he is forced to employ; the apprentice brooks with poor philosophy the corrections and advice of the master-workman; the collegian sneers at the old and time-honored curriculum, and even teachers themselves have been seduced by the prevailing spirit to open schools and colleges where nothing shall be taught that cannot be converted into gold or "legal tender" at a future day.

This spirit manifested itself first in our colleges, in the appearance of a section in their catalogues which furnished the names of "Irregular and Scientific Students." In nine cases out of ten these students were not attached to the regular classes, because they were either deficient in mind or industry, because they *could not* master the regular curriculum, or *would not*. And the superficial reader of these catalogues might have concluded, that such a class comprehended all those students who, possessing an extraordinary natural bent for certain subjects, had resolved to devote all their mental faculties to the study of these alone; while our experience has been that, with a few honorable, striking exceptions, such a conclusion would be grossly erroneous. Indeed we recollect an instance of one belonging to the class in question, who had gradually thrown off all other studies save Greek and Rhetoric, whose Greek was the worst of his class and whose Rhetoric bore but little resemblance even to the meagre text-book of Whateley which he vainly strove to master.

The next step was the creation of elective studies, in the junior and senior years, that might take the place of Greek, or even of Latin, with those students whose minds delighted especially in the so-called Natural Sciences, and who were unwilling to waste their days over subjects that would be of no practical utility in after life. The close application required in digging for the meaning of the ancient authors was hastily rejected, because the indolent student preferred to take up other studies, which were superficially presented in attractive lectures, without any requirement as to preliminary hard study on his part. On commencement days the same degree in the "Humanities"

was given to him, who had *shirked* their study, as was received by their faithful students. But even this concession did not suffice. More was needed. Why devote any portion of the college course to the dead languages? This is a practical age. Science now rules the day. Give us an education suited to the age.

The third step, therefore, was the establishment of a course of study, considered equivalent in value to the ordinary college course called the Scientific. From this, Scientific schools have been developed, more or less fitted to make engineers, chemists, naturalists, and the so-called *practical* men of every possible profession. These have become so popular that a kind of mania has seized many of our colleges for dropping the old college curriculum entirely, and presenting another, attractive from its novelty and boasted utilitarianism. Amid this furor for change some few institutions have firmly and bravely determined to nail the old flag to their mast-head, and under it to contend either for success or total defeat. The words of the President of Franklin and Marshall College on this point, in a late Catalogue, have the true ring: "A liberal education, it is plain, can be prosecuted with full advantage, only where it is the sole reigning object and care of the institution, in which it is carried forward. Such is the one single purpose of Franklin and Marshall College. The institution asks no patronage in any other character. It does not invite students promiscuously to its halls; but only students who desire a full classical education for its own sake. This may make its classes smaller than they might be otherwise. But for the object here in view, the importance of the institution does not depend on the size of its classes. It depends altogether on the way in which the object itself is pursued. There are those still who can appreciate this object; both young men of generous minds seeking education for themselves, and large-souled parents also seeking it for their sons; and for them the restricted view of the college may very easily appear in the light only of a large advantage. Better this, certainly, than that it should be a general *omnibus* for all sorts of teaching."

We do not oppose the establishment of Technological Schools, where instruction may be given, on all matters pertaining to Science, by competent experts to those who have been fully trained for its reception, or even to those whom necessity may compel to enter their doors with imperfect preliminary training. Although even here we find that the first scientific minds of the age insist that a general training shall always precede the special. In 1840 Baron Liebig himself protested against the teaching of science as then carried on in the Laboratories and Polytechnic Schools of Prussia, and declared that a knowledge of scientific principles must first be obtained before their applications should receive the attention of the student. In other words, science proper must receive attention before its application to the practical arts. And, in passing, we may remark that science proper can be best comprehended by the mind that has been trained in the "*Humanities*." But let us hear what the Baron says touching this special cause of complaint: "Nothing is more deleterious or dangerous than when utilitarianism is made the foundation of a system of tuition in a school, or where institutions, whose true aim ought to be experimental instruction in scientific principles, are employed to convert mere children into soap-boilers, brandy-distillers, or sulphuric acid manufacturers. All this entirely destroys the true purpose of the institution. I have found, in all those attending my laboratory who intended to pursue a technical course of study, a general predisposition to devote themselves to some branch of applied chemistry. It is only with feelings of fear and trepidation that they consent to follow my advice, and give up the time they thus waste on mere scientific drudgery to making themselves acquainted with the methods by which pure scientific problems are soluble, and by which alone they can be solved. \* \* \* There are many of my pupils, now at the head of many departments of manufacturing industry, who, having had no previous acquaintance with the processes, were in half an hour perfectly *au fait* with all the details of the manufacture, whilst in a short time they saw and introduced all sorts of necessary reforms and improvements. This power they had

gained by being accustomed in their laboratory work to obtain the most accurate and precise knowledge of all the substances which came into their hands in their work; they had to learn the conditions necessary for avoiding errors, they investigated the properties of the products of decomposition formed, and thus became acquainted with the sources of error, with the means of avoiding losses; they were able to improve their apparatus, and to amend their processes. *All this can never be learned when the work is conducted according to cut and dry methods."*

Take this protest of the first chemist of the age against utilitarianism, and see how it applies against the whole present theory of technological education, except as a sequel to that which finds its highest meaning in the general culture of the human mind for its own sake, in the formation of "an educated, a completed and Christian manhood." If the chemist complains because the attempt is made to produce the soap-boiler before the general principles of science are mastered, is there not much greater cause for complaint that even the principles of science are undertaken before the true strength of the mind is formed, and the student is trained to do a yeoman's task in the field of thought?

In this connection we may also quote the testimony of President Eliot of Harvard, one of the most prominent advocates of the so-called "New Education." Being himself a chemist, his testimony is all the more valuable. "Chemistry, physics, zoology, physiology, and all the other sciences, which deal much in theories, and require strong powers of imagination and combination, are unsuited to the undeveloped mind of boyhood.

\* \* \* We have seen many cases in which too early dabbling with the physical sciences proved a positive injury in later years, when the serious study of the subjects was to be entered upon. An unfounded notion that he is already acquainted with physics and chemistry is a grave injury to a boy of seventeen." The author then proceeds to advocate the propriety of keeping boys for Colleges and boys for Technical Schools in the same classes (excepting in Greek, the study of which should

be reserved for the former), and adds: "It is a great object, worth some sacrifices, to keep *all* the boys together, until the last year or eighteen months of their school-life. A boy's course of study should be representative; it should be so selected as to reveal to him or at least to his parents and teachers, his capacities and tastes *before he is seventeen years old.*

\* \* \* The teacher, mother or father can do nothing better for a boy than to find out, or help him to find out, this innate aptitude. But to this end the boy's course of study at school must be fairly representative. It must be neither language, science, nor mathematics chiefly, but all combined in due proportion. Parents who are able to do the best thing for their children, which is attainable in the actual state of American society, may be sure that their boys' training has *not* been right if it has not made possible for them all careers which start at or near that point."

Now if this testimony mean anything it is this: there is a course of study, comprising language, mathematics and science both natural and exact, which is most fittingly adapted for the development of the mental faculties of youth,—so particularly suited indeed for all cases that the author would have every boy brought up under its influences, so that his education might fit him for all possible careers. The author, however, then assumes that each will have his career definitely marked out for him when he attains the age of sixteen or seventeen, and that here will be the point, where the technical student and the old-fashioned collegian will separate, each pursuing a separate and distinct course of study. But we deny that, at the age specified, the boy is always, or indeed often, clear as to his future calling, and we claim that all the arguments brought forward against one-sidedness of education, prior to the age he has specified, apply with as much force prior to the age of twenty or twenty-one, when the boy, having attained full majority, and having been blessed with "an educated, a completed and Christian manhood," may be best fitted to enter upon the speciality his matured tastes and bent may incline him to, with the strength necessary to master it then in the smallest possible space of time. The argument against the

general use of the old college curriculum, as presented by this writer, breaks down just because he would have boys, at an age when they are rarely conscious of any special bent, decide whether they will adopt for their future careers those for which the Technical Schools have been created, or those supposed to be best attained by means of the college curriculum; and it may be employed with much force in favor of the old, time-honored, although much abused, college course. The intention of the preparatory and collegiate courses was, and still is, in those institutions that remain true to themselves, gymnastic and disciplinary. But "all processes that are properly gymnastic and disciplinary perform a service and impart benefits of which the recipient is unconscious at the time of receiving them, and which, unless he has given special attention to education as a study, he cannot fully appreciate by subsequent reflection."\* The athlete might ask, why this preliminary course of training, this course of dumb-bells, parallel and horizontal bars, climbing, leaping and jumping, this special dieting and avoidance of late hours with excess in eating and drinking? The soldier also might complain at his ceaseless daily and hourly drills in positions, facings and marchings, his tiresome repetition of the manual of arms, his wearisome practice of loading his gun by regularly defined stages and firing the same in accordance with fixed regulations? The training is disciplinary,—in the one case that he may accomplish feats of unusual muscular strength, rarely possible without a systematic education and development of his muscles,—and in the other that he may accomplish the greatest possible amount of execution in company with his fellow-soldiers, as well as be able to load his gun and fire the same to the best advantage, no matter what may be the exciting and perturbing influences surrounding him in time of battle. The athlete and soldier are only fitted for their duties after such training, as the experience of years has amply shown. The same slow and apparently tedious plan is pursued in giving instruction in reading. We require our pupils to name each letter successively, to pronounce each syl-

\* Porter's American Colleges.

lable that they form, in order that they may learn by this deliberate spelling how to pronounce the word correctly. We are aware that there are those who claim to have found a better method, by which reading may be taught directly without the preliminary training furnished by such constant and oft repeated spelling, but the conclusions arrived at by the experience of centuries cannot be thrust aside by the theories of a few or even by their apparently successful exemplification in exceptional cases. We know that the best readers are those trained in the old way. There is no royal road to learning, but each individual must find out, in his own experience, that it is a road full of toil and labor, although abounding in rich rewards for those who honestly undertake such toil and labor.

The experience of years has shown that a certain course of intellectual training seems best suited for the full development of the mental faculties of the young. This course has not always been exactly the same, although it has preserved its main features while undergoing certain changes adapting it to the age in question. It is not exactly the same here as in England or Germany, but it has been so modified as to retain all the advantages and to dispense with the disadvantages peculiar to instruction in those countries. *Theoretically* it is that which best disciplines the mind so that it shall acquire sufficient strength for all manner of mental labor, and such skill and logical system as will make this labor in the highest degree productive. The idea of the American College is by no means the same as that of the European University; and it is this American College which is now thrown on the defensive by the advocates of "the New Education." We have tried to show, from the testimony of two of the most distinguished of these, that it has claims, on the ground of disciplinary influence, which will not permit it to be lightly cast aside, and that, when its advantages can be secured, the youth will acquire, through its agency, special fitness for every kind of mental labor. Of course there will always be many, who from want of time or money, will not be able to resort to our Colleges and who must, therefore, enter with insufficient preparation upon the studies of the pro-



fessional and technical schools, but when indomitable ambition and special aptitude have made such gain high positions we claim that the cases are exceptional and not in accordance with the rule.

It is proper now to glance at the arguments *in detail*, which are presented by the defenders of the American College curriculum. These have been so well set forth by Prof. Noah Porter (the most prominent candidate for the Presidency of Yale College when the place shall be vacated at the end of the present collegiate year by the proposed resignation of President Woolsey), that we shall do little more than present them as found in his recent treatise on this subject. They are most valuable because presented by an officer of an institution, that numbers among its departments the Sheffield Scientific School, one of the best scientific schools in the country.

Prof. P. claims that "for the years appropriated to school and college training, there is no study which is so well adapted to mental discipline as the study of language." "It is the chief instrument of intelligence. It is thought made visible and clear, not merely to the person to whom thoughts are to be conveyed; but to the person who thinks for and by himself. The earliest discriminations and memories to which we are tasked by nature are those which are involved in the mastery of our mother tongue. \* \* \* The world of words is, in its way, as important and as real to the child as the world of things; and most of the intellectual relations of either things or thoughts can only be discerned by first apprehending and attending to the relations of words. \* \* \* As school life begins and advances, the intellect is tasked and disciplined by special classes of studies, the object of which is to train the intellectual power, and to furnish it with facts and truths. The mind is constrained to reflection and analysis. From acquisition, observation and memory, it proceeds to be trained to the independent judgments of science." This being admitted, it is claimed that the study of the classics is to be universally preferred to that of other languages, and the following reasons are assigned why the modern languages are inferior to them: 1.

"They are not so good to teach attention to the structure of language and all which such attention involves, and thus to train the student to the intelligent and facile use of English, or to the criticism of the same. They are not so good to prepare the mind to learn other languages than themselves with rapidity, intelligence and retention. They are not so good to prepare for the comparative judgment of the languages which one may learn. The exercise of such a judgment, whether it is employed for the remoter ends of the philologist, or the more general aims of the reflective thinker, is one of the most instructive employments of the educated man. No man can be a linguist, in the best and most intellectual sense of the word, who is not a classical scholar, because the ancient languages are the best material upon which to study language. \* \* \* Their structure is complicated yet clear, ramified yet regular, objective yet artistic, and in all these features they are pre-eminent above the modern tongues." 2. They are better discipline for the intellect, because they task the intellect more. 3. They furnish a better knowledge of man, directly and indirectly. "The man of the ancient world is a different being from the man of modern life. Stately, artificial, decided, clear in his opinions, positive and out-spoken in his aims, objective in his life, positive and sharp in his diction, impetuous in his impulses, grand in his connection with the state, heroic in his virtues and almost in his vices, he stands forth in striking contrast with the man of modern times—the idolatrous Pagan against the spiritual Christian, the self-cultured against the self-sacrificing, the idolater of country and the state against the worshiper of the Father and Redeemer of man. He is always intellectual, impressive, and intelligible, because he is the perfection of the natural and earthly in its purest and noblest manifestations." 4. They are better preparation for the study of modern history, because this has its roots in that which is ancient. 5. They more "efficiently further the intellectual and æsthetic culture of the student. \* \* \* Classical art, with its outlines as sharply cut as the faces of a crystal, and yet as graceful as the undulations of the moving waters, has not ceased

to be the model of beauty and grace to modern art, because the products of the last have been animated by the living spirit of Christian love, or warmed and elevated by the spiritual graces of Christian faith and hope."

But the curriculum of the American College prescribes, in addition to the classics, other studies: "The mathematics, as strengthening to continuity and rigor, of attention, to sharp and bold discrimination; physics, to give power over nature—real power, as we wield and apply her forces, and intellectual, as we interpret her secrets, predict her phenomena, enforce her laws, and recreate her universe; psychology, that we may know ourselves and so understand the instrument by which we know at all; ethics, that we may rightly direct the springs of action and subject the individual will to the consecrating law of duty; political science, that we may know the State, as to the grounds and limits of its authority; the science of religion, that we may justify our faith to the disciplined and instructed reason; history, that we may trace the development of man and the moral purposes of God; logic, rhetoric, and literature, that the powers thus enriched and thus trained may express themselves aptly and skillfully by writing, and in speech."

The objects had in view in the construction of the College curriculum were two: first, that all the powers of the mind should be exposed to the best possible discipline, and second, that the elementary principles underlying all knowledge as such should be secured. It strives against one-sidedness, it aims to present the fully developed, the well rounded, the cultivated man, ready to undertake any study for which such thorough preparation pre-eminently fits him.

Necessarily the aims of the American College will fail, if its Professors have not been well-fitted for their work by preliminary training, or are not alive to the responsibilities devolving upon them. And just here, we imagine, the assailants of our American College may find a vulnerable point, which they can attack with some probability of victory. No matter how excellent the curriculum may be theoretically,—there must be *live* men to fill the chairs of the Faculty and a *live* President to

give spirit and character to the institution. Where incompetence or indolence mark the former, and monastic seclusion and indifference to the age in which he lives presents itself in the latter, it is impossible that studies, which are mostly disciplinary, should be anything but wearisome and grievous burdens to the students under their care. We fear lest much of the hue and cry, now raised against our College course, has its justification in the character of the officers to whom the conduct of the same has been committed. The flag is a glorious one to fight under, but those who are expected to form the color-guard are often disloyal to the cause or lukewarm in the performance of the duties assigned them. The remedy, however, is simple. Such officers are excrescences, morbid growths, and should be treated with the most active surgery. No gentle cautery will be of any avail, no alterative treatment is admissible, nothing but the wholesome operation of excising every portion of the diseased mass can re-establish health and vigor. Men fitted by previous intellectual training, with hearts all aglow with enthusiasm for their work,—these are the officers needed in our American College. At present a spirit secretly hostile to the Christian religion imperiously demands that such officers shall not be taken from the ranks of the ministry, lest they may infuse too much of a denominational taint throughout all parts of the college course, as if a denominational taint even were not better than bold, unblushing infidelity;—lest a too exclusive clerical administration might lose sight of the obligations resting upon students as citizens of the State, as if a minister must necessarily forget that he is a man and as such has duties to perform. The learning of the world was for centuries in the hands of the clergy, and the labors of its members have not only contributed largely to the extension of philological and philosophical knowledge, but have also furnished brilliant contributions to Natural Sciences. After such a past record shall its members be declared *ex officio* incompetent for the office of teachers? We do not hold that the ministerial office *per se* fits a man for such duties, but we protest against the idea that it unfits him.

The unworthy men now employed in our colleges being removed and respectfully invited to find some other sphere of labor where their incapacity or indolence will not be so injurious to the rising generation,—the question arises: "How can their places be filled with reliable, competent, trustworthy men?"

The law of demand and supply is the same all through the universe. Create the demand, let it be deeply and truly felt, and the supply will come from some quarter. Let it be understood that the title '*College-Professor*' means one who has, by natural and acquired talents, entitled himself to the name of '*Expert*' in some branch of knowledge,—who is possessed of an ardent love for the same, and delights in imparting instruction therein to the young. Moreover, let it be understood that proper compensation will always be awarded to the possessor of such a title, and the number will increase. If, however, we rest content with mere pretenders and charlatans, their number will also increase, and diplomas will be still given away to any and every one who asks for them at the hands of such instructors.

If the want for thorough collegiate instruction is truly felt, there will be cultivated a spirit of liberality in endowing our colleges so richly that, not only shall stately buildings be erected for their accommodation but what is still of greater importance, all the appliances for instruction and study shall be secured, and the Chairs be so liberally provided for that the brightest intellects shall be stimulated by a laudable ambition to secure them.

Are there not, however, too many colleges now in the land? Yes—and No! Yes, if the question be of those that pander to superficial education and the easy acquisition of degrees which once indicated proficiency; No, if it refer to institutions fully equipped with men and means for the grand work they propose to accomplish. Better, however, strengthen that which is moderately strong, than contribute to the increase of the number of the weak and sickly. True, the field is open to all, but all cannot, with equal success, cultivate it. Therefore make those, that are now in operation fit for their work, or aid in

their extinction by some means that shall be effectual, and let no others be chartered without the positive evidence of full vitality and high, intellectual vigor.

Without the existence of American Colleges fully fitted to prepare students for higher undertakings, the dream of an American University will remain but a dream, for such an institution would demand from all knocking for admission into its halls "thorough discipline *previously* undergone and a liberal culture *already* attained." And the time will come when such a dream shall be realized, be it sooner or later,—but it can only come when we have perfected our Colleges. To this end, then, every scholar must, in his respective sphere, labor with genuine *esprit de corps*. We must also increase the number and efficiency of our preparatory schools, so that students shall enter the College classes with due preparation. We must make the Colleges real fountains of proper literary discipline, and the University will be established in good time. If the clergy have any special fitness for the office of instructors let them be employed, but if not, let other men of sound, Christian faith and with souls in full sympathy with the true, the beautiful and the good be employed, and a brighter day will dawn upon us than any we have yet experienced.

The American College is on the defensive now, but she can make a grand and noble defence, and must gain a certain victory if she only prove true to herself and the sound traditions of the past.

## ART. III.—THE VINE AND THE HUSBANDMAN.

BY REV. WALTER E. KREBS, A. M., IRWIN, PA.

FALLEN man needs, on the one hand, an atonement for his sin ; and, on the other, a pure and perfect life. But he cannot have one without at the same time having the other. No atonement can be real unless perfection of nature be the consequence, no perfection of nature is conceivable unless satisfaction be made for sin. Human nature, which is corrupt, requires to be permeated with a new principle of life, which, as it is in itself perfect, must at the same time be both human still, and bearing in itself the virtue of atonement. Such salvation, which is equivalent to re-creation, must come from God, and from God alone. God alone created man ; God alone can re-create him.

But God is triune. Each Person in the Godhead, according to the representation in the Scriptures, sustains a distinct relation to man's salvation ; and yet there are not three salvations, but one, as there are not three Gods, but one. Of the Father, in the Son, by the Holy Ghost. Our purpose, however, is to consider, not the peculiar activity of the Third Person, but that of the Son as distinguished from that of the Father.

Christ Himself gives us that distinction in these, His figurative but profound words, "I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman." Christ Jesus is "the vine," which contains all the life for the branches—the Father is "the husbandman," who planted the vine, and causes the branches to grow therefrom. The Son is the source of salvation. God is the power by whom that salvation is appointed and applied. Accordingly we read that "God gave His only begotten Son." "As the Father hath life in Himself, so *Hath he given* to the Son to have life in Himself." "God *spared not* His own Son,



but *delivered* Him up for us all." Thus it was God who planted the vine, and planted it deep in the heart of humanity. For by the sending forth of the Father, the Son was made of a woman, made under the law, *became* flesh, that He might be the source of life to all flesh. The Son of God is also the Son of Man, and so the divine life is in Him, the God-man, for the benefit of man. Hence He is "the way, the truth, and the life," and of His fullness have all we received.

But to receive His life, men must become branches. To become branches, they must grow out of Him. To grow out of Him, they must be implanted or engrafted into Him. Here the work of a husbandman is needed. "The Father is the husbandman." He, therefore, alone engrafts men into Christ. This St. Paul brings out, where he refers to the good olive tree, and the wild (Romans xi). "God is able to graff them in again." So also the Saviour says, "No man can come unto me, except the Father which hath sent me *draw him*." "My Father, which *gave them me*, is greater than all." "No man can come unto me except it *were given unto him* of my Father."

God, as the husbandman, not only planted the vine, but also brought it to perfection; He not only engrafts the branches, but also promotes their growth. The Scriptures declare that it is the Father who raised Christ from the dead, and highly exalted Him with His own right hand. Christ Himself says, "I live by the Father." As to the branches, it is declared that God who hath begun a good work in us will perform it or bring it to perfection by the time Christ comes again. St. Peter affirms that it is *by the power of God* that we are kept, through faith, unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time.

In reference to this subject, there are two great errors into either one of which we may fall—errors into which, in fact, the Church has fallen in the course of her history. The one error consists in ignoring or setting aside the Son as the vine; the other in ignoring or setting aside the Father as the husbandman. We apprehend the truth which has apprehended us, only when we recognize both the Son and the Father in their real character, the one as the vine, the other as the husbandman.

The one error is the setting of Christ aside as the vine, and

the substitution of *an eternal decree* of God in His place. As if the Saviour had said, "The eternal divine decree is the vine, and the Father is the husbandman, who executes it in time by means of the Son." Here Christ comes in as a mere means, and not, as He is in truth, the eternal source of life to all creatures. The power of the Father is magnified at the expense of that of the Son. If this be the case, can the Son be equal with the Father, as the Church teaches us to believe? If the Son comes in only afterwards to execute an eternal purpose in the mind of God, where is His eternity, and equality with God? St. John calls the Son the Word of God, and declares that He was in the beginning with God, and that He was God. He is the reality of thought, the expression of all idea or purpose of God. "In Him lay eternally the principles, the ideals, and possibilities of creation. It is this that constitutes the peculiarity or particular individuality of the Person of the Logos." If there be, therefore, any eternal purpose or decree of God, the Word Himself must be that purpose or decree.

Now the Scriptures do speak of election, predestination, and fore-ordination, *but it is always in connection with Christ*. In the first chapter of Ephesians we read that God hath chosen us *in Christ* before the foundation of the world; that He predestinated us unto the adoption of children *by Jesus Christ* to Himself; and that the mystery of His will, which He had purposed in Himself, was, to gather together, in the fullness of time, *in Christ, even in Him*, all things, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; and that it was His eternal purpose that we should receive our inheritance in Him. St. Paul teaches the Romans (viii. 29) that the Son, who is Himself the *first-born*, is the image or pattern, to which the predestinated are to be conformed, from which it follows that He must either be before the decree, or is the decree Himself. For how could God predestine men to a certain image before that image was in His own mind? And is not the Word of God that eternal image? His eternal purpose God purposed *in Christ Jesus our Lord* (Eph. iii. 11). Accordingly we read of Christ Himself as being "fore-ordained before the foundation

of the world" (1 Peter i. 20), and as "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world" (Rev. xiii. 8), terms as broad, to say the least, as any that are used respecting fallen man.

It seems thus plainly to be the teaching of the Spirit, that the Word is the eternal purpose of God, and that creatures are included in that purpose only as they are in Him. In one sense they may be said to be in Him from the beginning, but now since the Fall the creature man is in Him by regeneration. God eternally elected, fore-ordained, predestinated His Son, and men as they grow out of Him. Truly then is He the vine. And the Saviour's words, "I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman," may express also the *eternal* relations existing between the Father and the Son. In the fullness of time the eternal Word became flesh, that the purpose and mystery hid in His person might become manifest, and that what was involved therein *in potentia* might be evolved *in actu*. In 2 Timothy i. 9, 10, Paul speaks of God's purpose and grace which was given us in Christ Jesus *before the world began*, but *is now made manifest by the appearing* of our Saviour Jesus Christ; and in Colossians i. 26-28, he speaks of Christ in us as the mystery which had been hid from ages and from generations, but is now made manifest unto His saints.

It makes all the difference in the world whether we look at Christ first and His people afterwards; or His people first, and Christ afterwards. The latter way is mechanical and arbitrary, the former only is natural and in accordance with the workings of life. When a husbandman plants a vine, it is not the branches, the leaves, or the grapes that he plants, but the vine. He does not sit down and determine beforehand how many bunches, leaves, or branches he wants, and then go and plant the vine in order to realize his wishes, but he plants the vine, and he knows that if it flourishes and grows, that out of it will spring forth, what are involved in it from the beginning, the desirable fruits. "The tree in fact is the true ground and foundation of all the life that is comprehended in the branches, blossoms, and fruit; to such an extent, that they cannot exist at all, nor be so much as conceived even to exist, except through its presence

and power." So God did not choose the Jews and then Abraham, but Abraham and the Jews in him. Going back further, God did not determine a human race and then Adam, but Adam, or the man, and the race in him. Going back furthest of all, God did not choose certain ones to be His people, and then Christ to make them such, but He chose Christ and His people in Him. "He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world."

Many of the best minds in the Church of every age have given prominence to the so-called Decrees of God, and regarded this doctrine as shedding light upon all others. The ancient Church had its Augustine, the Reformation period its Calvin, and more modern times an Edwards. These all spoke from the depth of their Christian experience. They felt and were constrained to acknowledge that it was the free power of God that, without their aid, made them what they were, and that brought them into the kingdom of grace. Others around them were not enjoying the same favor. What was the cause of the difference? To this question no answer could be found but an eternal decree of God in favor of the salvation of some, and the condemnation of others.

It is submitted whether this is not a losing sight of the Eternal Word, who in fullness of time became flesh. Does not He Himself say "I am the *light* of the world?" Can, then, the Christian mind see any light, as far as any doctrine, or anything in the past, or future is concerned, *except in Him*? Do the inspired Apostles, who yet uphold and maintain as rigidly as any, the free grace and mercy of God in the salvation of men, ever run out into this Christless direction? Do they ever suffer the person of Christ to be lost behind anything like an impersonal decree? In the days of His flesh, Jesus did not allow any one to expect any good, even the greatest, outside of or beyond His own Person. When Martha and Mary looked to the last day for the resurrection of their brother, Jesus pointed them, both by word and act, to Himself. "*I am the resurrection, and the life.*" When Thomas wanted to know whither He would take them, and the way, Jesus said, "*I am*

the way, the truth, and the life." When Philip desired to see God the Father, even this great demand did Jesus answer by pointing to Himself, saying, "He that hath seen *me*, hath seen the Father." If, in view of all this, some of His disciples should now ask, "Has not God from eternity decreed that we should be saved?" might we not expect to hear Him say, "*I* am that decree, the eternal purpose of God?" At any rate St. Paul tells the Ephesians that they are predestinated according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will, and that that *eternal purpose* He purposed in *Christ Jesus our Lord* (i. 11; iii. 11).

The reader of St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, and of Calvin's Institutes of the Christian Religion, can not help but be struck with the fact that the name of Christ occurs so frequently in the former, so seldom in the latter. In the Institutes, besides, there are as many quotations and arguments from the Old as from the New Testament Scriptures, and light, instead of going the *other way*, is made to shine from the former upon the latter. These are significant facts. Do they not seem to imply that other "light and life" than *Christ*, is needed? It is also a noticeable fact that the Reformers and Confessions generally (the Heidelberg Catechism excepted) of the sixteenth century are strongly Calvinistic. Is it because, on leaving the corruptions of Rome, they for the time lost sight of, or, to meet an important church-question, chose to overlook, the Church as the mystical body of Christ, built upon Him and bearing His life to the end of time, and found a resting-place in the only logical substitution, the doctrines of the decrees, of the elect, and of the final perseverance of the saints? Suppose, for the sake of argument, that it were a fact, that God could not possibly know who would be saved and who lost, except by Himself first determining and ordering the salvation of certain ones, and leaving certain others in condemnation; suppose that He did eternally decree that He would call this and that individual into existence under a state of sin and death, and that by means of His Son, He would save these and no more, the solemn question might still be asked, would it be

right and proper for the Christian philosopher, with the example of the Holy Scriptures before him, and recognizing the eternal nature of the Word and the reality of His becoming flesh, to make such determinings and decrees the rock for his mind to rest on, to make them the starting point or basis of his theology, the centre of his faith and hope, the light of his life? What then would he do with Jesus, which is called Christ? To say the least, it is certainly *safe*, and no risk to run, either for our theology or our life, to fix our eyes wholly upon *the living person of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*, in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily; the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning, and the end, the first and the last, by whom and for whom all things in heaven and in earth, visible and invisible, were created, and in whom all things subsist; the Hope of Israel, the Desire of all nations, the Redeemer of the world.

*Christ Jesus* is the true vine, purposed in eternity, manifested in time. What higher can a man's election be than his potential existence in the Word from the beginning, and his being engrafted into the Word made flesh, as a branch, that had fallen off, into its native vine. Three thousand Jews on the day of Pentecost were thus engrafted by the Holy Spirit in Baptism, and afterwards others by the same means were also added to the Church, who were declared to be in this manner in the way of salvation. Thus also were the Gentiles in Antioch on Paul's preaching set in the same order to eternal salvation, who gladly heard the word and believed (Acts xiii. 48). Not that every branch thus set in Him must be necessarily on that account saved in the end, for some branches, branches actually in *Him*, it is positively asserted by Himself, *are taken away*; and therefore are they all exhorted to work out their salvation with fear and trembling, and make their calling and election sure. We are made partakers of Christ, provided we hold our first foundation even unto the end (Hebrews iii. 14). Being predestinated to be conformed to the image of His Son, called by His grace, and justified in the sight of God, we are required to run our race as He ran His, *to look to Him* not to anything out-



side of Him, to suffer with Him, to endure temptation as He endured, and then with Him shall we be finally glorified.

The other error consists in ignoring or setting aside the work of God the Father as "the husbandman." In this, Christ is duly looked upon as the source of salvation, but the only power, the power of God, by which that source is made available to man, is not properly recognized or apprehended.

As in the other error, the so-called decrees of God are put in the place of Christ; so in this, in the place of the Father *feeling* is substituted. This error acknowledges to some extent the presence of a divine power, but it is only in the way of *assistance*. That is to say, when a man of the world, by divine aid, repents of his sin and believes in the Lord Jesus Christ, he becomes thereby *ipso facto* full partaker of the redemption of Christ. This is the same as to say that a branch cuts itself loose from its parent stock, moves itself over into the vine, and secures itself there, the gardener, in the meantime only standing by, and, either by keeping up the proper temperature and moisture of the atmosphere, or in some other way, assisting in the process. Is this absurd in nature? It is just as absurd in grace. The two worlds are too nearly parallel to admit a process in the latter, which is impossible in the former. And yet who has not heard in these latter days of men being considered and pronounced engrafted into Christ or regenerated, when, by the influence of the Holy Spirit through the preaching of the gospel, they feel at first greatly distressed for sin, and then a sudden emotion of joy, when they come to be resolved to submit to Christ and His salvation? If this be the new birth, where, it may be asked, is the operation of God, beyond this mere assistance? Is not this, after all, a saving of one's self? Would not this be a bearing or begetting of one's self?

This dependence upon feeling is sometimes carried so far as to shut out, for a while at least, all knowledge or perception of Christ Jesus, the Saviour, and to set up feeling itself in His stead. We have had accounts of conversions, in which every feature of the process is faithfully delineated, from the terror of Sinai to the internal peace which is the goal sought after, and



the name much less the grace of Jesus not once referred to or mentioned. This is in fact the general tendency of the error. It may go so far as to meet the other error, and unite with it in ignoring Jesus Christ as the source. How often are Calvinist and Arminian found walking together, gaily swinging their joined hands, when they are making a grand effort in the community to bring multitudes to the travail of such a birth! So closely connected are the peculiar operations of God, and the Son, in human redemption, that ignoring only one in the beginning, we ignore also the other in the end.

The piety and devotion of the many men and women, who are living in the cordial embrace of this error, we do not doubt or deny. Neither do we deny the existence of feeling in religion. Yea, more; we do not deny that sinners must be brought to conviction, and to feel sin as a great burden, and to be greatly concerned for their salvation, and that when they first come to apply the promises to themselves, and determine to throw themselves into the arms of Jesus, they experience a peace of mind which none but he that feels it knows. But we do emphatically deny that this is the new birth, or regeneration. It is a mere mental process. It is a process or experience through which a Christian passes, to a greater or less extent, on every occasion when he is betrayed into any particular sin. In the case of a sinner, it would be but a standing in the vestibule of salvation, or rather at the door only and knocking. Notwithstanding all his groans and tears and emotions of joy, something must be done to him and for him by God Himself. He must be by Him engrafted into Jesus Christ, in and through the means appointed in the church for this end. It is just here where the Calvinist is right when he insists that no man can save himself, that he must be saved by the grace and power of God alone. It is neither his penitence nor faith, neither his pain nor his joy, *it is God*, that positively brings a man into the possession of the life of Christ, whereby only he can be saved from death and raised to immortality at the last day. "By the grace of God, I am what I am." "By grace are ye saved." "*God* hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not

according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in *Christ Jesus* before the world began (2 Tim. i. 9)." And this is the grace conferred by God in the Holy Sacraments—this is their meaning and power. "According to His mercy He saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." "Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life"—"Take, eat; this is my body; this is my blood of the New Testament, drink ye all of it." This view may be called the *life-system* of the Scriptures and the Church in opposition to cold Calvinism on the one hand, and bald Arminianism on the other.

This error of hiding from view the objective activity of God the Father by the clouds of individual feeling or personal experience arose in the Church as a reaction against cold orthodoxy and dead formalism, just as the doctrine of the decrees, which obscures the light of the Sun of Righteousness, answers as a standing-place for many who do not accept in their Creed the Church of Christ as a living organism, and a grace-bearing institution. Many made use of the means of grace, and were outwardly attached to the Church, without repentance and faith, and without bringing forth the fruits of good living. This error is fast going, or has already gone, to the opposite dangerous extreme, of undervaluing and then totally neglecting the Holy Sacraments. As men are not saved without repentance and faith, just as little can they be saved without the grace which is now found only in the Church, in the use of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

This change of mind or feeling might indeed be all that is needed, if the fall of man consisted only of a change in his feelings. But the fall of man was his severance from the life of God, and the consequent corruption of his nature. This corruption shows itself most palpably to the natural eye in the diseases of the body, and in the separation of body and soul. Is a mere revolution in one's feelings sufficient to restore this nature, to raise the body from the dust, and the soul from the dead, and re-unite them in the glorified life of heaven? No! God by the Word created man, and God, by the same Word

made flesh, re-creates him. "*God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son.*" "*To as many as received Him*"—received Him by repentance and faith—received Him, if you please, by groans, and tears, and emotions of unspeakable joy—"even to them that believe on His name, *gave He power to become the sons of God.*" That must truly be a superficial sort of exegesis that refers to subjective faith or feeling such profound expressions as these: "*Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you.*" "*We are members of His body, of His flesh and of His bones.*" "*Your life is hid with Christ in God.*" "*If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature.*"

If God be not the husbandman, and we be our own husbandman by the exercise of feeling, must not our feeling be in a state of constant exercise, when we sleep as when we wake, in our business as in our devotions, in sickness as in health, when we die as when we live? Here feeling fails, just when and where its power would be the most needed. How different the ever-present, never-changing power of God! "*My flesh and my heart faileth; but God is the strength of my heart, and my portion for ever.*" "*Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil; for Thou art with me; Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me.*"

*"I am the true Vine, and my Father is the Husbandman."*

## ART. IV.—THE CREED AND DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.

BY REV. E. V. GERHART, D. D., PROFESSOR IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,  
MERCERSBURG, PA.

IN a former Article, published in the July number of this Review, 1870, we endeavored to unfold the nature of dogma and Dogmatic Theology, considered from the historical point of view; laying stress chiefly on the living process of thought going forward continually in the bosom of the Christian Church. The dogma being the form which the faith assumes in Christian consciousness in virtue of logical reflection is valid for the time being, but not necessarily for all subsequent ages. It is the apprehension of the truth mediated by faith, and stands so long as the life and with it the thinking of the Church represents the type of the epoch in her history which generated the dogma. But so soon as the given epoch ceases to be the determinative power, and the life of the Church passes into a new stage of development, the reigning dogma loses its commanding influence and gives way to a different form of apprehension answerable to the character of the new period in her history.

This dogmatic process, however, is not a lawless process, not one that simply reflects the fluctuations of the human mind, and is wholly at the mercy of the predominant philosophical tendencies. Whilst dogma succeeds dogma, apparently as wave succeeds wave on the surface of the ocean, there is also an internal power which informs the movement and holds all fluctuations bound to a living, unchangeable type of truth. The dogmatic process, great as are the changes developed in its history, is governed by a law that does not change. That law is the objective Faith; the Faith as expressed in the ecumenical Creeds of the Church, and particularly the Apostles' Creed, which is primary and fundamental.

We do not intend to imply that this fundamental law has always been allowed properly to govern dogmatic thinking and systems of dogmatic theology; much less that a system has ever been constructed, which is the perfect counterpart of the Creed. On the contrary, every one cannot but recognize it as a historical fact that the Church has not only not succeeded in developing a perfect science of her Faith, but also that theological science has fallen far short of its aim, and has even at times held views and pursued methods of thought that contradict the genius of the Creed. But this admission is not incompatible with the idea that the Creed has always wrought, with more or less legitimate force, as the fundamental law of theological science. Amid all the fluctuations of doctrine, and in every reaction from one extreme defective view of truth to another, we can discern the silent operation of an internal spiritual force, which held the thinking of the Church steadily to the solution of the same great questions. Through the entire history of the Church we can also discern the same noble endeavor, at least in the leading minds of every age, to reach a better and more satisfactory apprehension of the supernatural mysteries that enter into the organism of her Apostolic Faith. Hence there has been unity in the process of development notwithstanding all the fluctuations and contradictions that appear on the surface of the life of the Church.

Whether acknowledged or not, this fundamental relation of the Creed to Dogmatic Theology has always been felt; and in the degree in which the sense of this relation has been quick and pure has theology been able, on the one hand, to escape the perverting influence of false systems of Philosophy, and on the other to make positive advances upon previous attainments.

We propose to inquire into this fundamental relation; in order to ascertain as far as possible the nature and extent of the determining force which the Apostles' Creed should have in the sphere of dogmatic thinking.

The Creed is not, like philosophy or science, the product of reflection and logical reasoning. It is primary. As faith in the existence of the natural world is antecedent to natural

science, so is the Creed before theology and in order to it. The dogmatic process supposes the Creed as its basis. It contains the material of rational investigation. The Faith of the Church being a living power in her communion that quickens and informs her Christian consciousness, provokes and sustains dogmatic reflection. The Church believes; therefore she must think.

The Apostles' Creed presupposes two general facts:

It presupposes, first, the reality of supernatural revelation, or the presence in the world of a new spiritual constitution that proceeds from and stands in the life of the incarnate Logos, and is realized among men as a distinct communion by the coming and indwelling of the Holy Ghost; a constitution that is different from and contrary to the fallen human race and the existing order of the world.

Secondly, the Creed presupposes an intuitive response in the life of mankind to this new spiritual constitution, or a new general consciousness that is awakened in the subjects of salvation, a consciousness that flows spontaneously from the activity of the new general life of which the individual members of the Christian communion have been made partakers through the quickening agency of the Spirit.

These two distinct facts suppose and complement each other. To be the subject and partaker of grace supposes the presence of the supernatural order or economy of grace; and the presence of such a supernatural economy assumes a capacity on the part of men of receiving it, and implies subjects in whom it is realized and through whom it prevails. There is an objective order and a subjective apprehension of it. These moments are active reciprocally as factors. Of the reciprocal activity of these factors, the Faith of the Church, or the Apostles' Creed, is the immediate product and the primary form of expression.

An analogy to this intuitive product of the life of the Church we have in the primary beliefs of the human reason. Men universally believe that the external natural world exists. They believe in it before they reflect upon it. This primary

belief presupposes two things, entirely different but reciprocally complementary, namely, the objective existence of the natural world, and in organic connection with this the necessary awakening and development of a sense and a consciousness of the fact that the natural world does exist. Neither one can be by itself. If there were no outward natural constitution there would be no human consciousness. The converse is valid also. If there were no human consciousness there would be no objective natural constitution. The assumption of a world without man as its head and crown would contradict the idea of the world. So are related to each other the spiritual constitution of grace and the sense which believers have of its existence and presence in the world.

By the agency of the Holy Spirit the almighty power of this new economy apprehends fallen men, takes them up into its communion, and makes them partakers, or the subjects of its own life and salvation. Then standing in the bosom of this new spiritual world, as before they stood in the bosom of the old fallen natural world, the first form of intuitive activity is *faith*, or the necessary recognition of the presence and nature of the spiritual economy by which they are surrounded. Apprehended by the powers of the spiritual world, the Church in turn apprehends. She apprehends that by which she is apprehended. Passive under the new-creating power of the Spirit, she is also, being created anew, active in the Spirit.

Faith is in one respect the deepest and in another the highest form of human activity. This is true of natural faith. It is equally true, to say the least, of Christian faith. Faith includes all the elements of our spiritual existence, feeling, consciousness, and will. As the deepest form of human activity it is the principle of spiritual feeling, spiritual knowledge, and spiritual self-determination; being the central power which gives character to experience, to intelligence, and to moral freedom. As the highest, faith is the organ of spiritual apprehension, or the apprehension of the new spiritual creation in Jesus Christ, and the medium of free, conscious communion



with Christ and with the new spiritual world in which the believer lives.

Thus by the new-creating agency of the Holy Spirit, the activity of God, and by the responsive power of faith, the activity of man, there is established a living and ethical communion of the Church with Christ; a communion that is both objective and subjective. The communion involves on the one hand the organic oneness of the Church with Christ as her Head, and on the other the necessity of a spontaneous confession, a confession of Christ and of the spiritual constitution that stands in His incarnate Person.

The self-feeling and self-consciousness of the Church corresponds to what the Church herself is in her objective relation to Christ and the whole mystery of grace; just as the self-feeling and the self-consciousness of the fallen human race corresponds to what the fallen race itself is, in its objective relation to the violated law of God and to the power of evil prevailing in the constitution of the natural world. The Church believes intuitively according to the law of her spiritual life. What the Church believes she at the same time must also feel, and know, and will according to the law of faith; and what she knows by faith and loves, the nature of her life impels her to confess. Apprehended of God the Father in the Son, by the Spirit, the Church believes in one God, One in Three and Three in One, and therefore confesses one God, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, God the Father Almighty, God the Son incarnate, God the Holy Ghost given and ever-abiding in her communion.

This intuitive confession of Father, Son and Holy Ghost by the Church is the Creed. The Creed expresses the original form of Divine truth. It expresses also the original form of Christian faith. The Creed articulates both, the order of divine revelation and the order of human salvation, in one constitution; being determined by the force of a twofold law of one and the same new life. The one law is objective, prevailing in the mystery of grace itself; the other subjective, prevailing in grace apprehending fallen mankind. The objective law is the

law of life in the Person and work of Christ, or the organic law that underlies and governs the order of supernatural revelation from the conception of Christ by the Holy Ghost to His Second Advent in glory. The subjective law is the law of life in the mystical body of Christ, or the organic law that underlies and governs the actual process of salvation in the regenerate human race and in the world. Though these two forms of life are properly thus distinguishable, they are not essentially different, much less contrary, but are in principle only one mystery; the law of salvation prevailing among regenerate men being but a continuation and development in the Church, and in her individual members, of the objective law of divine-human life in Christ that governs the order of supernatural revelation. But as the life and salvation of Christ in believers, the subjects of apprehending and renewing grace, involves a new and peculiar form of feeling, of consciousness and will, or in a word involves a new human belief, new both in kind and form, the law of this new human life and human belief may properly be regarded as subjective.

The Creed unites in itself the force of both laws. It is an organism in which this twofold necessity is embodied and expressed. It embodies in one concrete whole the order of divine revelation and the order of human salvation; joining thus together in one that which is believed and that which believes, or the *fides quæ creditur* and the *fides qua creditur*. The Creed has therefore properly been called the *regula fidei*, the rule or law of Faith, and as such possesses a positive authority for the Church which is subordinate only to that of the New Testament, which by way of necessary distinction has been commonly designated as the *norma fidei*, being the original inspired record and the ultimate measure of Christian truth.

Considered *historically*, the Creed has grown out of the formula of Holy Baptism, or rather out of the confession of faith which Baptism requires. This Confession is its tap-root. As the Sacrament of Holy Baptism, in accordance with the institution of our Lord, was administered in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, so was it ne-

cessary that the applicants for Baptism possess a corresponding faith, and make a corresponding confession of faith in the Father, and in the Son, and in the Holy Ghost. This confession is the response or answer of a good conscience toward God, to which reference is made by the Apostle Peter in his first Epistle, iii. 21.

The baptismal confession, historically considered, is not however absolutely first. The germ of it is found in the memorable confession of Peter: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," Matt. xvi. 13—20; or in the same confession of Christ made by Simon Peter, as recorded in somewhat fuller form by St. John: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we believe and are sure that Thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God." John vi. 66—69. In the apostolic period, this simple confession of Christ as the Son of God, was sufficient in some instances, for Baptism: Compare Acts viii. 33—38; also xvi. 30—33. The Ethiopian Eunuch simply confessed Christ, saying: "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God;" whereupon both Philip and the Eunuch went down into the water, and he baptized him.

This simple confession of Christ first made by the Apostle Peter, is principal. It carries in itself potentially the whole truth of revelation. Jesus Christ, the Son of the living God, being the central fact of the economy of grace, or the principle of a new spiritual constitution, supposes all that goes before in the history of supernatural revelation and postulates all that follows after on to the final consummation. He as the Son supposes God as His Father; and the Son as Christ implies the Holy Ghost, in and by whom the Word was made flesh, and suffered, and died, and rose again for our justification. Thus inwardly related the simple Petrine confession of Christ as the Son of God unfolded itself into the more extended formula of the baptismal confession. As the confession of Christ implies the Father and the Holy Ghost, so was it necessary for faith distinctly to enunciate the Father and the Holy Ghost in proper order; and so the confession of One becomes the confession of Three in One. The baptismal confession is

accordingly only the full expression of the idea that is involved in the original confession of Jesus Christ as the Son of God.

The baptismal confession is; however, itself not the complete expression and form of the Christian Faith. It is also relatively principal. The Father is Creator, or the fountal source of all created existences. The Son is the principle and author of the new creation or the economy of grace, in and by which fallen men are redeemed. The Holy Ghost is the author of the Church, in which He lives and mediates the actualization of the life and salvation of Christ among men. These three, creation, redemption, sanctification, are however not three disconnected and separate forms of divine activity; but three stages rather in the historical evolution of one idea and purpose; each one implicating the other two; and the last stage, the glorification of redeemed man in the new heavens and the new earth, being but the absolute completion of the primal act of the divine will in bringing the first creation into existence.

Hence no work of God is the work of One only and not also of Three. The Son and the Holy Ghost are related to the Father in the work of creation. All things are of the Father, by the Son, without whom was not anything made that was made, through the Spirit who moved upon the face of the waters. Gen. i. 3. By the *Word* of the *Lord* were the heavens made and all the host of them by the *Breath* of His mouth.

The Father and the Holy Ghost are related to the Son in the work of redemption. God so *loved* the world that He gave His only begotten Son. All things that the Father hath, saith Christ, are mine: therefore He, the Spirit of truth, shall take of mine, and shall show it unto you. (John xvi. 15.)

The Father and the Son are related to the Holy Ghost in the work of sanctification. The Son sends the Comforter from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, who proceedeth from the Father; the Holy Ghost whom the Father will send in my name, saith Christ, will guide you into all truth; for He shall not speak of Himself; but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak. John xiv. 26; xvi. 13. The Spirit testifies of the

Son, who is the image of the invisible God, by whom all things were created; of the Son incarnate, the Christ, who is the head of the body, the Church; the beginning, the first-born from the dead. In Christ Jesus the saints are builded together for a habitation of God through the Spirit. (Eph. ii. 19-22).

Father, Son and Holy Ghost being thus related to one another objectively in one threefold divine activity, the baptismal confession carries in its bosom necessarily *two other elements* or formative forces.

The *one element* respects the three distinct forms of divine activity and manifestation. The confession of the Father implies the work of the Father, in which the Father is and reveals Himself. God as God, active only in the sphere of His own eternal glory, does not challenge our faith. Only in that He goes out of Himself in creation, and is active above all, and through all, and in all, is He accessible to the human spirit. (Eph. iv. 6). The invisible things of God from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and godhead. (Rom. i. 20). In God we live and move and have our being. (Acts xvii. 28). Thus related to us, not abstractly, but in a concrete order of existence, a true confession of God involves the confession of His work in which revealing Himself He really confronts our faith.

The confession of the Son implies the work of the Son, in which the Son lives and reveals Himself. As of the Father so of the Son, true confession supposes a form of real presence. The Son incarnate, active in a real work of redemption on earth, confronted the faith of Simon Peter and the other Apostles. Ascended into heaven and glorified, He reveals Himself in the living constitution of grace, the Church, His mystical body, in which as the head He lives by the Spirit. The language of Christ is: Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on Me through their word; that they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me. Hence in confessing the Son, we

must also confess the work of redemption in which alone the Son has proceeded forth from the Father and coming into the world has established a real communion between Himself and us, whereby alone faith in the Son has become possible.

The confessing of the Holy Ghost implies the work of the Holy Ghost, in which He abides and reveals Himself. The Church having been brought into existence by the outpouring of the Spirit, we know Him only as He manifests Himself in the communion of the Church. We know Him in our regeneration, in the forgiveness of sins, in our justification by faith, and in all the fruits of the Spirit which as members of Christ we bring forth in our lives. As no man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost, so no man knoweth the Spirit but he in whom the Spirit dwells. "But ye know Him, says Christ, for He dwelleth with you and shall be in you." Jno. xiv. 17. St. Paul adds: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." 1 Cor. ii. 14. Thus we cannot truly confess the Holy Ghost unless we at the same time confess the economy of grace, in which He abides, and through which He apprehends us and makes us partakers of the grace of Christ, the love of God and the fellowship of the Spirit.

The *other element* which the baptismal confession carries in itself respects the internal relation to one another of these three distinct forms of divine activity and manifestation. Creation, redemption and sanctification being but different stages in the historical evolution of one idea of God, who is One in Three and Three in One, the true confession of God in one form of revelation requires the confession of God also in the other correlate forms of revelation. The confession of the Son in the work of redemption involves an internal relation to the work of creation by the Father and to the work of sanctification by the Holy Ghost. The confession of the Father in the work of creation implies in like manner a relation to the work of sanctification by the Holy Ghost, and to the work of redemption by the Son. And the confession of the Holy Ghost in the

work of sanctification supposes a relation to the work of redemption by the Son and to the work of creation by the Father. Apprehended by the Father in the Son through the Spirit, and therefore living by faith in the love of the Father, in the grace of Jesus Christ and in the communion of the Holy Ghost, we recognize in the communion of the Spirit the end and fruit of the work of redemption by the Son, in the grace of Christ the revelation of the love of the Father, and in the love of the Father as revealed in the Son by the Spirit the fountal source of creation, of redemption and sanctification.

Corresponding to these two elements, or to what we may call a twofold formative force in the nature of the baptismal confession, there has been a twofold development of the formula in the faith of the Church. The formula of baptism has developed itself in the Creed, so as to affirm the three distinct forms of activity of the one God, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, of God the Father as maker of heaven and earth, of God the Son in the several supernatural facts constituting the mystery of redemption, of God the Holy Ghost in His relation to the Church and to the mysteries belonging to her constitution and history. The formula has also developed itself in such organic order as to affirm these different forms of divine activity in the relation which they bear to one another objectively, or in the history of divine revelation.

The facts which the Creed affirms, and the order in which the Creed affirms them, include moreover a direct reference to the nature and condition of mankind. The Creed supposes the creation of man in the image of God, the fall of man through the instigation of Satan, and the helpless misery of the fallen race perishing under the power of sin and the curse. Whilst these facts are in the nature of the case excluded from the Creed itself, they are nevertheless assumed, being the occasion of the work of redemption and sanctification. The Creed, however, implies more than this. It also postulates the nature of the salvation which is going forward in the Church and in the personal history of her members. Not only the Church as a whole passes through a history corresponding to the history of



her risen and glorified Head, but also every true believer. Beginning in Baptism for the remission of sins, his new life of faith in Christ requires a crucifying of the flesh, a dying unto sin, an uninterrupted conflict with the world, and must issue in the resurrection from the dead unto life everlasting. The objective movement of the Creed exhibits thus by necessary implication a corresponding order in the subjective process of salvation.

In the baptismal formula of confession accordingly we see a general law or formative force that inspires and governs the normal and full development of the Christian Faith as held by the Church universal in the Apostles' Creed. It is related to the baptismal formula as the mustard tree is related to the grain of seed, the entire completely articulated faith being potentially in the first and most simple form of confession. (Matt. xiii. 31, 32). The Apostles' Creed is, therefore, to be regarded as an organic and comprehensive whole. On the one hand it comprehends the entire history of revelation extending from the creation of the world to the Second Advent of Christ, or all the essential facts belonging to the objective constitution of divine grace, and all these in their true historical order. On the other hand it affirms by necessary implication the entire process of salvation in fallen man from his birth of water and the Spirit to his resurrection and glorification, or all the stages of growth in the life of the Church and of her true members, and all these stages in an order demanded by and corresponding to the objective history of supernatural revelation.

The nature of the Apostles' Creed determines the relation which it bears to theological reflection and Christian Dogmatics. We may express this relation in a general way by the term *law*. The Creed is the fundamental law, as we have called it, of dogmatic theology. In the Creed we have the *principle*, the *material*, and the *order* of dogmatic thinking and of a valid system of Dogmatics. It determines also the necessary subjective *condition* of legitimate theological study.

The Apostles' Creed embodies the *principle* of Dogmatics. Being the normal and full development, as we have shown, of

the baptismal formula, the Creed resolves itself into three parts; reflecting thus the unity and trinity of God.\* The second part supposes and manifests the first, and the third part follows by inward necessity from the second. The second part is therefore central, not only in the external construction of the Creed, but it is central internally. It governs the external structure because it is the plastic force of the inner constitution of the Creed. This central position of the intermediate articles concerning the Person and redemptive work of Christ, relatively to the article going before concerning God the Father, and to those following after concerning the Holy Ghost and the Church, corresponds to what we have seen to be the historical development of the baptismal confession from the primal confession of the Apostle Peter.

Dogmatic Theology is the Science of the Creed; which is the sum of the Gospel, as the Heidelberg Catechism teaches. In other words, it is the scientific apprehension of the contents of the Christian Faith, its aim being to reproduce completely in the sphere of thought the objective truth of divine revelation which the Creed affirms and confesses. Whilst, as in every other science, this process of thought seeking to apprehend and reproduce the truth systematically, is governed by the categories and laws of the human reason and must therefore be logical throughout, the logical process on the other hand must be determined as to its subject-matter or contents by the objective truth itself. What the truth of revelation is objectively the science of the truth must be subjectively, or what the one is in reality the other must be in idea. Only so far forth can theological science be valid.

That theological science may be valid in this sense, the fact which occupies the central position in the history of revelation and in the constitution of the Christian Faith, must be central

---

\* Compare Heidelberg Catechism, Ques. 22. What is it then necessary for a Christian to believe? *Answer:* All that is promised us in the Gospel, which the articles of our Catholic, undoubted Christian faith, teach us in sum. Also Ques. 24. How are these articles divided? *Answer:* Into three parts; the first is of God the Father, and our creation; the second, of God the Son, and our redemption; the third, of God the Holy Ghost, and our sanctification.

also in the sphere of consciousness and thought. That fact, in idea, must occupy a corresponding position relatively to all the doctrinal views that appear in a scientific system. Then only can a system of theology answer to the order of truth of which it claims to be a reproduction in the sphere of thought. Thought must begin where faith begins; and thought must develop itself into a systematic whole from that dynamic point from which has grown the full confession of faith. Otherwise instead of the correspondence of idea to reality there will be opposition; instead of harmony, discord. Developed from some other point of observation a system of theology may indeed be a system, and contain many correct doctrinal views, but as a system for want of the true fundamental idea it cannot reflect the truth of revelation as a whole; and even the correct doctrinal views which it may contain will be more or less vitiated by the force of the logical relation in which they stand to a false principle.

The divine-human Person of Christ being the central fact as of supernatural revelation so of the Christian Faith, the true principle of Dogmatic Theology is the Christ-idea. Or we may say the principle is the faith that Jesus Christ is the Son of the living God. This fundamental idea must evolve itself organically. It must be the formative force in the development of our dogmatic conceptions respecting all the other facts of revelation. This idea must govern our conceptions of God, of His attributes, of His triune existence; also of His activity *ad extra*, of creation and providence; our conceptions respecting the manifold facts belonging to the work of redemption, the life, death, resurrection, exaltation and the second coming of Christ; and also our idea of the relation which the Christian religion sustains to the Mosaic economy, and the New Testament to the Old. It must govern our conceptions respecting the Holy Ghost, His Person and coming, His abiding presence and office; also respecting the Church and the communion of saints, the Sacraments, the ministry, the sacred Scriptures, and the future history, the triumphs, and the final consummation of the kingdom of Christ. All departments of Christian Dog-

matics, theology, Christology, anthropology, pneumatology, soteriology, eschatology, are to be viewed in the light of the incarnation, the Word made flesh, as being in accordance with the constitution of the Apostles' Creed the true point of departure and observation.

From the same stand-point are the questions to be solved, so far as this may be done, that grow out of the relation of Christianity to paganism, to pagan philosophy, science and art; of revelation to natural religion, and of faith to reason; of the Church to the world, to the State and to civil institutions, and to the natural relations of social life. Whether these various important and difficult questions can be solved satisfactorily or not, so much at least is certain that we are in the way of a correct solution of them only in as far as we conduct our inquiries consistently with the idea that Jesus Christ is Himself the Truth of all truths. And to the extent that, ignoring this principle of thought and criterion of judgment, we examine and endeavor to solve these questions exclusively in the light of reason and philosophy, will we, as men have in all similar attempts in time past, run into bewildering confusion, and stumble into the gins and pitfalls of error.

The Creed contains the *material* of Dogmatic Theology. Given the principle of a science, and we have by necessary implication its material; the science being no more than the evolution and organization of the fullness of the principle. Thus the idea of a plant gives us the domain of botany, its contents, scope and limitations; the ideas of light and sound, in like manner, determine the vocation respectively of optics and acoustics. The science of Dogmatics sustains the same relation to its principle. The idea of the Word made flesh, or the Christ-idea, determines the sphere of the science, and fixes its limits; the science being only the organic evolution of the infinite fullness of this idea in the sphere of thought. This idea involves all the supernatural mysteries of grace as affirmed by the Creed. These mysteries apprehended by faith become the contents or subject matter of Dogmatics.

The science of Dogmatics must therefore include all the facts

that belong to the supernatural constitution of grace, as these meet us in the organism of the Creed. The science must comprehend also whatever the Creed necessarily presupposes and postulates, namely, the first Adam created in the image of God, the kingdom of Satan, the fall of the human race in the fall of Adam, the radical power of sin and the consequent universal contradiction and disorganization wrought by its unbroken dominion, the mystery of death extending beyond the narrow confines of the grave, the ultimate destruction of the present perverted cosmical order, and with this the complete overthrow and subjugation of the powers of darkness.

Thus in the light of the Creed we determine the contents of Dogmatics, and also its necessary limitations. To be complete it must include the positive facts of revelation on the one side, and on the other all that revelation necessarily presupposes and implies; and exclude whatever does not properly belong to either one of these categories.

Hence it behooves the science also to construct a theory of nature and the cosmos in the light of its own fundamental principle; but not from the stand-point of paganism, or of the natural reason, or of a purely metaphysical hypothesis. Dogmatics consider nature and the cosmos from the stand-point of the Christian Faith, that is to say, in the light of the incarnate Logos. All things are of the Father by the Son, who is the image of the invisible God. The universal cosmical order was constituted by Him, exists for Him, and consists or stands in Him; expressing His eternal idea, and ruled by His supreme will with reference to an ultimate end which will be the consummation of His own free purpose. For by Him were all things created, that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers. He, the all-creating, all sustaining, all-governing Word of God, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man. It is He, thus related and constituted who is the Head of the body of the Church; the beginning, the first-born from the dead; that in all things pertaining to the crea-

tion, to providence and to the work of redemption and human salvation He might have the preëminence.

The science of Dogmatics aims therefore at determining the position and meaning of the cosmos in its relation to God as its original ground, and to Satan as the source and principle of perversion and disorganization; also in its relation to the economy of redemption, to the Church, and to the second advent of our Lord. A Christian idea of nature and of the cosmos embraces a view also of man, the head and crown of the natural world: a view of man in the totality of his constitution, and in all his relations backward and forward; a view of him, however, which like that of the natural world is to be governed by the central idea of revelation, not by the dark intuitions of the natural reason.

Dogmatic Theology excludes philosophy and natural science in all its departments. These are not a part of it. It does not indeed ignore their true value and their legitimate relation to the Church and to Christianity, but the science does not incorporate them as they are, much less is it ruled by them. As revelation supposes a corresponding receptivity in man; as the incarnation supposes a capacity in fallen human nature of being created anew and assumed into organic union with God; so does theological science suppose a certain degree of positive fitness in the science and wisdom of the world to be taken up and turned into the service of the Church. Every system of philosophy and every philosophical movement, however defective and one-sided it may be, or however far short it may fall of a true solution of its own problem, contains important truth which may be made subsidiary and subservient to the progress of theological science. The same thing may be affirmed of all the discoveries of natural science, no matter how fanciful and destructive the theories may be which savans rear on the basis of their discoveries. But Dogmatics, whatever service philosophy and science may render to it, can not be determined by their false spirit. It must exclude every species of metaphysical speculation and scientific inquiry, that does not rest on the basis of the Faith, and does not aim at a solu-

tion of philosophical and scientific problems in the light of the Faith.

The Creed determines the *order* of Dogmatic Theology. Like the contents, the form of a science is ruled by the plastic force of the principle. The principle of the Creed governs the movement and form of the Creed. The sense of an article is not in itself alone separately considered, nor in itself as separately related to the central fact of the Creed; but the sense of an article is in itself as related to all the articles that go before and to all the articles that follow after, and through these as related to the central fact of the Creed.

The central fact of the Creed being the principle of Dogmatics, the general order of the science must be the same as the general order of the Creed. Whilst there may be properly, as in the vegetable kingdom and other departments of organic nature, great variety of form, there is in theological science, as there is also in nature, a general objective type which a valid system can not violate. This general type requires a valid system to be not a mechanical collocation of dogmas but an organic whole in which God and creation, Satan and the kingdom of darkness, the fall of man and the dominion of sin, Christ and redemption, the Holy Ghost and sanctification, the Church and her final consummation, occupy a place and have force relatively to the Logos and the incarnation and relatively to one another, that corresponds to the position and force which these several positive and negative mysteries have in the organism of the Creed and in the objective constitution of divine grace. As the facts of revelation stand related to one another in the historical movement through which the economy of grace is established, so must the corresponding doctrinal views be related to one another in the science of revelation. The objective law of the economy of grace governs the subjective order of a dogmatic system.

Therefore no order can be normal that starts in a false principle of Christianity. No order is normal that arranges dogmas according to a human theory of religion. No order is normal that is governed by a metaphysical conception of God



and divine things, or is moulded by a system of philosophy. The original order of the Creed requires all these forms of theological science to be set aside, not as destitute of truth and value, but as inadequate to the demands of the Christian Faith; since none of them can realize the fundamental type of a true system. As neither philosophy nor science, nor any species of metaphysical speculation, can furnish the material of dogmatics, so neither can either one or all determine the order and form of the science. The Faith itself contains the one and governs the other.

The Creed determines also the *subjective condition* of theological study. It establishes the *sine qua non* of scientific reflection on revealed truth. This indispensable condition is personal faith, the *fides qua creditur*; without which neither the individual theologian nor the Church as a whole can make any true progress in theological science.

The Creed joins in one organic communion the object and the subject of the Christian Faith, or the supernatural economy of grace existing in the world and the free, conscious response and affirmation of regenerate man. It says: I believe in God the Father; I believe in Jesus Christ, His only begotten Son; I believe in the Holy Ghost. Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and the *I believe* are joined in one constitution. Both sides are equally essential to its existence. The absence or non-existence of either side, of the objective or the subjective, would involve the destruction of the Creed.

As both factors are essential to the existence and reality of the Creed, so both factors are essential also to Christian knowledge and valid theological activity. Were there no supernatural revelation or no real economy present in the world, we could not speak of Christian knowledge and theological science. Christian knowledge would be mythical superstition; theological science, fanciful speculation. What is not cannot be known. Equally impossible would Christian knowledge be, if there were no faith; if the *I believe* were not a living fact. Where there is no faith there exists no normal relation between him who desires to know and that which is to be known, or between the reason of the person who thinks and

the object on which he presumes to reason and think. No real connection with the economy of grace prevailing, an effort to know can issue only in vain human notions and in a caricature of theological science.

That according to the Creed, this nominal relation stands on the human side, in personal faith, and not in the understanding, or in reflection, or logical reasoning, is plainly taught in the New Testament, in the Heidelberg Catechism and in all protestant confessions. If any man will do His will, says Christ, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself. Jno. vii. 17. Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world? for after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God; it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. 1 Cor. i. 20, 21; comp. also Jno. iii. 16; vi. 29; Matt. xviii. 2-4. This principle is either affirmed or implied in all the books of the New Testament. Indeed the necessity of faith in order to communion with Christ and the knowledge of God is one of its chief characteristic features. The same thing meets us in the Heidelberg Catechism. "By faith I am a member of Christ, and thus a partaker of His anointing, in order that I may also confess His name." Ques. 32; comp. also Questions 20, 59, 60, 61, and many others. According to the Catechism and the New Testament the *I believe* of the Creed affirms accordingly the true, proper, necessary, ethical attitude as of the Christian so also of the theologian.

Personal faith in a real constitution of grace, in the sense of the Creed, makes this constitution a reality for the theologian, and enables him to deal with it as a reality. Faith does not of course make grace what it is objectively. Grace is in no sense the product or effect of personal faith; what it is in itself as a supernatural constitution existing in the world, it is independently of any response from the individual theologian. But personal faith establishes a living relation of this supernatural constitution with the theologian, and thus with his consciousness and rational activity, so that it becomes *for him* a reality. By faith he sees it, feels its presence, and enters into communion

with its life. By the power of the true faith which he exercises he passes into the domain of the Christian Faith by which he has been apprehended. Then the objective truth of the economy of grace obtains access to his own ethical nature, and becomes a power in him directing and molding logical reflection and scientific study.

Just this personal, living apprehension of an objective constitution of grace is Christian faith. Personal faith is not mere blind submission to external authority; nor an intellectual assent to a valid proposition concerning Christ or the work of redemption; nor is it the acknowledgment of a given system of divine truth; nor is it the holding of a correct theory respecting God, His moral government, and the redemption of man by Jesus Christ. Nor yet is faith devotion to a conception of the truth. Rightly considered, this kind of faith, so called, which resolves the economy of grace into a correct theory of religion or into a system of truth is at bottom unbelief, since it involves a rejection of Christ and His kingdom. It refuses to accord to Him and His kingdom any substantive truth and real presence in the world. True faith is not only receptive and passive, but also perceptive and active, mediating between man and God. Apprehended in a real way by the economy of grace, and taken up into its sphere, that economy has no internal force for his moral and religious life nor for his scientific thinking, unless recognizing its presence and supernatural character he by the power of his own will in turn lays hold of the economy of grace and surrenders his life to its determining influence. The responsive activity of man complements the regenerative and sanctifying activity of God. Thus only is there a personal communion established between man and the divine-human mystery of grace, between him who thinks and that of which he thinks, in virtue of which he is able to recognize in this mystery a real organic constitution present on earth, possessing supernatural resources, powers and agencies requisite to the realization of its own purposes and ends. Then like a sound eye to the light, is a theologian rightly related to the object of thought, and it becomes possible to think

consistently and logically respecting the nature of the glorious mystery.

The want of such living faith is equivalent to a denial of the objective reality of the mystery. To an unbelieving theologian the mystery is *terra incognita*; as the western continent was to the nations of Europe before the discovery by Columbus. Logical reflection respecting revelation, the Church and salvation proceeds from the stand-point of the natural reason, which accords reality, at most, only to nature, to the material world and to man, but ignores the presence of a supernatural constitution; and in consequence resolves the substance of the mystery of grace into an abstraction, or into a merely ideal economy, an unsubstantial system of divine activity. The natural reason, destitute of spiritual vision, can in the nature of the case do nothing else. Denying the substantive truth of Christianity, there is no alternative but to deal with it as a plan of the Divine mind or a human system of religion. Theology becomes the pure product of metaphysical thinking, like algebra; and involves the quintessence of infidelity.

No man can be a true dogmatico-theological thinker who does not pronounce the articles of the Creed *ex animo*. He must acknowledge the real presence among men of the supernatural mystery of grace, and live in communion with it by faith as in the bosom of a new world.

Thus the Creed as it determines the principle, the material and order of a valid system of Dogmatic Theology, so it also establishes the subjective condition of all valid dogmatic thinking.

This general view of the relation of the Apostles' Creed to Dogmatic Theology is sustained by the genius and structure of the Heidelberg Catechism. Here the Creed is central. The first part of the Catechism deals with what the Creed presupposes, the fall of man, sin, guilt, and the helpless misery of our fallen life; the third part deals with what the Creed postulates, repentance or conversion, obedience to the law of God, and devotion or prayer, whilst in the second part we have the

mysteries themselves of the Christian Faith, and these in the organic order in which they stand in the Creed, God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, Three in One, One in Three, the Father and creation, the Son and redemption, the Holy Ghost and sanctification. The order in which these several facts of revelation are presented is not a mechanical or arbitrary arrangement, but is governed by the internal necessary relation which they bear to one another. Whether or not the argument corresponds at all points perfectly to what the mysteries of the Faith require, is a question that pertains to the degree in which the ruling idea has been actualized, not to the nature of this ruling idea itself.

Taking the Apostles' Creed as the fundamental law of a Confession of Faith and holding it subordinate only to the Word of God, the Heidelberg Catechism by way of necessary implication also recognizes the Creed as the fundamental law of theological science.

---

#### ART. V.—REBEKAH.

BY R. LEIGHTON GERRHART.

WHEN, now, the palm with drooping head,  
Swayed by the wind that blew around,  
From his great leaves, slow dripping, shed  
His dew-drops, glittering, to the ground,  
Rebekah, from the bounds that close  
The scenes so dear to memory grown,  
Will issue out, and pass to those  
That mark a land but coldly known.

Will pass through unacquainted lands,  
And towered cities rich and strange,  
By windy wastes of fiery sands,  
And sombre mountain's lonely range,  
Till, thus, she reach, by paths untried,  
A country by a shining sea,  
Where streams of water softly glide,  
And all is dim with mystery.

A mystic land ! for oft was told,  
With whispered words, and looks of fear,  
The stories wild, and legends old,  
Of strange events that happened there ;  
Of visions seen ; of war and blood ;  
Of people scourged by a viewless hand,  
O'erwhelmed by night with fire and flood,  
And swept forever from the land .

But, one of beauty, too ; for there,  
Adown green slopes of fertile hills,  
Through happy valleys blooming fair,  
Far sparkling show the cooling rills ;  
And peaceful skies dream, still and blue,  
The landscape o'er ; and many a flower,  
Of peerless form and tropic hue,  
Adorns the long luxurious hour.

And she, in all her purity,  
A gentle maiden, now will ride  
Into that land beside the sea,  
And there through many years abide ;  
Just as a star, whose glad'ning ray  
Its native world doth sweetly cheer,  
Might leave its place and pass away  
To light with joy another sphere.

And on the camel's patient neck  
Her sandaled foot did lightly rest ;  
And shining like a sunny fleck  
Her hand the crimson saddle prest ;  
Then surely mounted ;—from the ground  
The white-haired camel gently rose,  
As lighting them with radiance round  
The rising sun his glory throws.

There leaning on his slender spear,  
His long blue mantle falling low,  
The good old servant stood anear,  
With ancient beard, and wrinkled brow  
And silently, with upturned face  
On her he gazed with reverent eye ;  
Her loveliness and maiden grace  
Enchanted him thus standing by.

The holy promise that was said  
To righteous Abram filled his mind ;  
He did not know to what it led ;  
His thought was vague and undefined ;  
Yet, heavenly powers their presence lend,  
And guarding shield her as she goes,  
Led on toward that glorious end,  
Which the dark future will uncloze.

Above the common walks of men,  
In peace amid the ceaseless strife,  
To a hope transcending human ken,  
Her own bright way she goes through life.  
And thus he stood, and thus he thought,  
While fair the wind about them blew,  
With morning cool, and fragrance fraught,  
Swaying the palm that o'er them grew.

Her comrades gathering round her stood ;  
With trembling voices wonder-stirred  
They spoke, and told in tearful mood  
The wide spread rumors lately heard.  
"She goes to be the bride," said one,  
"Of him, who is both rich and great ;  
He, rivaled in that land by none,  
There lives supreme in princely state."

"He is to be a king!" replies  
A girlish voice light ringing clear ;  
With parted lips, and eager eyes,  
At this all quickly turn to hear.  
"He is to be a king ! and reign  
O'er proudest nations of the earth,  
And o'er a far and wide domain,  
Where lie great stores of untold worth.

"Such monarch ne'er on earth hath been,  
For this to man God hath revealed,  
And ne'er will be on earth again,  
All for some purpose yet concealed."  
And on Rebekah, now once more,  
They turn and look ; and soft aver,  
"Oh, we ne'er thought in years before,  
So great a thing would happen her."



But ah ! as more and more they knew  
 Of that which yet did her await,  
 The greater still the wonder grew,  
 And dimmer seen her coming fate ;  
 Till folding round her there did stay  
 A vail of stillest mystery ;  
 A gentle being she, whose way  
 Led to a wondrous destiny.

But fast the camels sped away ;  
 And now they crown a neighboring height ;  
 Then broader grew the golden day,  
 And faintly seen they fade from sight.  
 And thus in all her innocence  
 She far from home and friends doth ride ;  
 Ah ! will she e'er return from thence ?  
 Oh, may no harm her path betide.

#### ART. VI.—HEAVEN VIEWED UNDER A LOCAL ASPECT.

BY REV. F. A. GAST, A. M., LANCASTER, PA.

THE CONCEPTION of heaven which alone harmonizes the statements of Scripture and meets the requirements of the human constitution, includes a material place as well as an inner life. It needs but a glance to see that the heaven of Quietism,—a purely spiritual heaven in holy souls reposing in blissful meditation in God,—is not the heaven of the Bible. Inspiration points us to a definite realm of creation, filled, as no other realm is filled, with the Divine glory ; where beatified spirits, animating immortal bodies, form a vast temple in which God dwells with all the fulness of His life ; and where even external nature, in virtue of its organic relation to the sons of God, reflects a beauty, and exhibits a freedom and refinement, elsewhere unknown.

If heaven, then, lies, as revelation tells us it does lie, within the limits of creation, it is only natural to ask, where is this glorious world of light ? There is a present antithesis between

heaven and earth: heaven is God's throne, earth His footstool. There will be a future antithesis between heaven and hell: heaven will be the home of everlasting life and joy, hell the abode of everlasting darkness and despair. Heaven, accordingly, does not now, and never will, embrace within its happy domains the immensity of space with its countless orbs. It is a region with distinctly marked bounds, a region located somewhere within the compass of the created universe; and faith looks up and asks, where?

Such an inquiry has little meaning and less interest for those who see in heaven a spiritual experience only, transcending the conditions of time and space. A spiritual experience may be realized in one place as well as in another; and whatever scenes of beauty and splendor may surround the redeemed, they can only be a matter of the most perfect indifference, if the spirit, at death, soars with unbounded freedom into an ethereal sphere with immensity as its home, and eternity as its lease. As soon, however, as we rise above this vague and dreary spiritualism which transforms heaven into a realm of shadows and its inhabitants into dim spectres, and comprehend the full significance of the Christian doctrines of the resurrection of the body and the glorification of the world, the question of locality no longer seems trivial. It does not satisfy the believing mind to say, that "wherever purity, truth, love, and obedience prevail, there is God, and that is heaven." That is but a half-truth, and it could find utterance only where mind and matter are placed in irreconcilable antagonism. If heaven is a reality, then faith, which seeks to make clear to itself the objects on which it fastens, must connect it with the world of reality stretching out before our view. A purely inward, ideal heaven, standing in no relation whatever to astronomic localities, may be the heaven of the philosopher, but it is not the heaven of the Christian. Our faith carries in it the blessed assurance of an eternal home, where the ideal fully penetrates the real, and the real is glorified and made beautiful in the light of the ideal.

Where, then, is that home—the realm of real ideality or of ideal reality? Let not the question be dismissed as one of idle

and impertinent curiosity, because its answer is not essential to a pious life. "Faith," says Lange, "longs to harmonize everything with itself, and to pervade it with its spirit; it desires to make everything religiously transparent and holy, and to change all knowledge into theology." And as modern astronomy has made us acquainted with the unspeakable grandeur and almost illimitable extent of God's universe, it has become a necessity to bring the beliefs of religion into harmony with the results of science. "If there are any who frown upon all such attempts as not merely fruitless, but reprehensible and dangerous, they would do well to consider that, although individually, and from the constitution of their minds, they may find it very easy to abstain from every path of excursive meditation, it is not so with others, who almost irresistibly are borne forward to the vast fields of universal contemplation—a field from which the human mind is not to be barred, and which is better taken possession of by those who reverently bow to the authority of Christianity, than left open to impiety." \*

Indeed, one of the strongest motives for pursuing our inquiry is the skeptic's open and confident assertion that the astronomical discoveries of the present age have already undermined, and will ultimately annihilate, the Christian belief in a local heaven; just as the geographical discoveries of a former age destroyed the Pagan belief in the home of the gods on the glistening peaks of Olympus. In primitive times, when but a small portion of the earth had been explored by man, all that lay beyond the region he had traversed was a land of mystery which he peopled with the beautiful creations of his fancy. In the west lay the Golden Garden of the Hesperides; in the east, the divine cities of Meru; in the fiery desert, the Banquet-Halls of Ethiopia; in the central ocean, the fragrant Islands of Immortality; and beyond the snowy summits of Caucasus, the happy land of the Hyperboreans.† But all such dreams, in which the ancients

---

\* Taylor's *Physical Theory of Another Life*, p. 171.

† Alger's *Doctrine of a Future Life*, p. 583.

put a childlike faith, were rudely dispelled by the traveler, who, prompted by curiosity or greed, visited those legendary abodes and found them not more beautiful or more highly favored than his native home,—ill-adapted, at all events, to serve as the seat of Elysian Fields. “And so,” we are told, “the Christian heaven has vanished, or is vanishing, in the light of modern science. It has been banished farther and farther from the earth as the researches of astronomy have penetrated deeper into space. In whatever distant realm of creation the speculative theologian may locate his heaven, he is ever pursued with sure and steady pace by physical science, in whose light heaven, save as a spiritual state, fades away like a lovely dream. The astronomer has swept the stellar dome with his telescope; he has studied the stars one by one; he has measured their distances, weighed their masses, ascertained their physical constitution; and, among all those myriads of shining worlds, he has not discovered one that resembles in the faintest degree that home of immortality and glory which is the object of the Christian’s hopes; until now, after weary search, all faith in a definite locality, destined to be the future abode of redeemed souls, has not only become vague and ineffectual, but has well nigh died out.”

And is it true that the well-ascertained facts of science are at war with the Biblical view of the world? Must we cease to believe in the Father’s House, because the astronomer cannot point it out through his telescope, or assure us of its existence by spectral analysis? Assuredly not. It must be admitted, indeed, that the notions entertained by an earlier age, in regard to the locality of heaven, are scientifically false. We no longer believe that the sky is a solid arch spanning the earth, and that above this blue canopy God and His holy angels dwell in unspeakable splendor. But what of that? The crude fancies of the simple and uneducated are one thing; the sacred representations of Scripture are quite another. These true science, whatever its future progress, will never be able to set aside. The form in which they are clothed may be technically inaccurate, since the Bible speaks the language, not of science, but of

homely, every-day life; but the contents which they embody is religious truth, and as such impregnable to all assaults. Still, the infidel astronomer alleges his objections; and the Christian, who must be able to give a reason for the hope that is in him, is compelled to vindicate his faith. He sees in the Ascension of the Lord a connecting link between the researches of astronomy and the Biblical doctrine of heaven. If the Redeemer, clothed with the flesh and bones which the disciples handled as proof of His resurrection, visibly ascended up on high, then we are assured that in the material heavens, stretching out before our gaze, there is a material world where the glorified yet material body of the Incarnate Son of God has taken up its abode; and when at night we lift up our eyes to the starry dome, we can with the utmost confidence say, "Somewhere, in that broad expanse of space, the King of kings and Lord of lords occupies the throne to which He ascended eighteen hundred years ago, and which He will continue to occupy, ruling the armies of heaven and the inhabitants of earth, till He returns to this world to judge the quick and the dead."

Where, then, is heaven? The question is not so trivial as many, with their vague, indefinite notions of the future life, are disposed to think, but the answers given are most various, oftentimes highly fanciful, and not unfrequently indeed extremely absurd. It is not our purpose now to pass these different theories in review. There is one, however, so widely popular at the present day, especially with the English mind, and withal so exceedingly plausible from a scientific point of view, that it may not be amiss to bestow upon it a moment's notice. It may be denominated, not improperly, the Sun Theory. Isaac Taylor\* has presented it in a fascinating manner, and brought to its support an array of scientific facts.

Assuming that there are now in the universe two great classes of rational beings, both corporeal, but the corporeity of the one dissoluble and that of the other indissoluble; and taking a glance at the great sidereal economy, consisting as it does of two

---

\* "See *Physical Theory of Another Life*," chap. 16.

classes of bodies, the one subordinate to, and wholly dependent upon the other, this other apparently adapted to a much higher mode of existence than the former, he thinks that "the supposition almost forces itself upon us, that, while the planets are the places of animal organization and the schools of initiation to all rational orders, the sun of each such system is the abode and home of the higher and ultimate spiritual corporeity, and the centre of assembly for those who have passed their preliminary era upon the lower ranges of creation." Suns, in his opinion, are constitutionally adapted to support immortal life, while planets are the abodes of a life that necessarily decays. "While the surfaces of the planets, and all the vegetable and animal species thereon subsisting, are liable to an alternation of heat and cold, of light and darkness, and therefore live through returning periods of excitement and repose, and this both diurnal and annual; the surface of the sun, with the species it may support, is uniformly and perpetually exposed to its maximum of heat and light. That is to say, the solar tribes, vegetable and animal, instead of passing, at regular intervals, from stimulus to exhaustion—from activity to rest, sustain (if we should say, sustain) an equable impulse from the external elements. But stimulus and excitement are conditions of existence implying inertia and decomposition, and where there is no such alternation of action and inaction, we may assume that there is neither a spending of forces nor a dissolution of structure. The physical idea of solar life, followed out on the apparent fact of the unintermitted tensivity of light and heat, and implying also the constant action of all powers dependent thereupon, will amount to little else than to a conception of incorruptibility and immortality."

The theory sometimes undergoes a modification, according to which the final heaven will not be the several suns of the various planetary systems, but some vast central sun around which all the innumerable orbs that fill the boundless fields of space are supposed to revolve with majestic sweep. And as each sun is a place of assembly and a home of immortality to the different rational orders of its own system, so that grand central sun

will be "the home of a still higher order of life and the theatre of a still more comprehensive convocation of the intellectual community." It is highly probable, if not indeed absolutely certain, from the observations of astronomers, from the nature of gravitation and from still other considerations, that the so-called fixed stars, among which our sun is numbered, are not stationary, but have a real and proper motion of their own in space. Ever since the middle of the last century there has been a growing conviction that all the systems of the universe are circling around a common centre. Now, if the entire cosmical system is constructed after the pattern of our solar system, it would have for its centre a vast sun, "bearing as great a proportion, in point of magnitude, to the universal assemblage of systems, as the sun does to his surrounding planets. And since our sun is five hundred times larger than the earth and all the other planets and their satellites taken together, on the same scale such a central body would be five hundred times larger than all the systems and worlds in the universe."\* This, it has been conjectured, is the Throne of God and the heaven of the redeemed. The idea is indeed overwhelmingly sublime. Think of the magnitude of such a central sun—so grand, so stupendous, that it infinitely transcends the largest conception the human imagination can form; think of its almost boundless power, reaching out to the utmost verge of creation, enchainning the countless myriads of worlds as its vassals, and compelling them through the irresistible might of its attraction to move around itself in unanswering obedience; think of the grandeur of the celestial scenery, the objects of sublimity and glory, presented to the immortal eyes of those who inhabit this magnificent region, where the stellar firmament is ever varying like the shifting scenes of a panorama—since according to the calculation of Maedler, the great year of the Universe, in which the heavens complete a single revolution around their centre, comprehends eighteen millions of terrestrial years; think, moreover, of its eternal, cloudless sunshine, and of the mild radiance

---

\* Dick's *Philosophy of a Future State*, p. 224.



of its perpetual spring;—and we are forced to exclaim, “Surely, if there be such a glorious orb as this, it may well form the Palace of the Great King and a fit abode for the most exalted of His children.”

We shall enter upon no direct refutation of this theory; but we propose rather to present, in a positive form, a view which is in harmony, as well with the facts of science as with the statements of the Bible. We shall simply remark in passing, that the results of astronomical research tend rather to disprove the existence of a central luminary of such huge proportions and resistless power. It is a mistake to transfer the relations and arrangements of our solar system to the sidereal heavens, and to suppose that, as our sun has its planets revolving around it, so each fixed star is a sun with its accompanying planets, and that these suns again are but the satellites of a still greater sun which holds all the orbs of the universe to itself by the force of gravitation. Endless variety reigns in the stellar regions: the astral systems are no uniform repetition of the solar system. And while it hardly admits of a doubt that all the systems of the universal cosmos are moving around a common centre, yet it is now highly probable, from the laborious investigations of Maedler, that that centre is not such a gigantic mass of matter as the theory in question supposes, but that it is a comparatively small body, if not, indeed, empty space. At all events, the existence of a central sun, like that spoken of by Dick, is too problematical to serve as a support for the Biblical view of heaven.

One thing, however, is certain: the heaven of God’s glorified children is not to be sundered from the heaven of the stars; for, however much it may transcend the conditions of earthly materiality and the limitations of earthly time and space, it is not exalted above all materiality or freed from all relations of place. Since it is the home of embodied spirits—of the glorified Son of Man and the children of the resurrection—it cannot be an unimaginable, intangible sphere beyond the bounds of creation, but must have a material basis, a local platform, lying somewhere among those glorious orbs above. It may be

asked, indeed, what has heaven to do with the stars? We answer in the language of Lange:—"The inward is not without the outward; hence the homes of the blest, who shine as the sun, must be illumined habitations, bright and radiant worlds on high. The reverse is also true, that the outward is not without the inward. For this reason, we cannot possibly conceive of the starry worlds as profane wastes, forsaken of spirits and lying outside of heaven. Only then should we err by too much positiveness if we should say, yonder sun, or that particular star of the first, second or third magnitude, and so on—these are the homes of our sainted friends. We may locate the city of God where the divine glory unfolds itself in the most refined and radiant Spirits, where Christ reigns with His saints blessed in the vision of God, as high as we will above the visible stars and above the reach of the largest telescopes, yet must we ever conceive of the way to it, as a way through the visible world of stars, a way through the heavens (through the regions inhabited by spirits); and we cannot represent the highest point to which our faith ascends, either as an entirely inner heaven, nor yet as a place of detention in dark and formless ether. It is not the body, but the spirit, which is the essential of man; not those orbs or worlds are the essentials, but God's indwelling Spirit in these worlds; but just as the Spirit of man comes to a blooming manifestation in his body, so also heaven, in the upper worlds; yea, even in its first degrees here on earth already is heaven manifested, since the earth itself consecrated in Christ to God, is itself changed again into the heavenly essence."\*

Here the question arises, Is heaven a single world,—the bright Sirius, perhaps, or the beautiful Alcyone, or, it may be, some central sun, now invisible to mortal eyes? Is it a single globe, specially created to be the common receptacle of the glorified inhabitants of other globes, and surrounded by unnumbered myriads of orbs, which may be visited, indeed, by the happy inmates of heaven, but which lie like profane regions beyond its holy confines? Is it not, rather, a vast realm, including

\* The Land of Blessedness, Mercersburg Review, Jany., 1854.

within its compass many worlds,—a series of created spheres rising one above the other up to the heaven of heavens, and embracing, it may be, a large part, possibly even the larger part, of the visible universe?

It is very true that heaven, as the antithesis of earth and other unglorified worlds, is a unity. It is not to be viewed as primarily a place, however beautiful, but rather as the expression of a religious idea,—of that *Kingdom of Glory* for which all creation in its inmost heart is yearning as the grand finale of the entire movement of the world's life,—as the glorious consummation, which shall remove all antitheses and effect a perfect harmony between God and the universe, as well as between the world of nature and the world of mind—as the last and highest result of God's revelation of Himself, in which the divine idea will be fully realized, the partial and fragmentary forever done away, and God Himself will become all in all. But this kingdom, in which perfected spiritual personalities constitute the habitation of God, and material nature is brought by renewal to share in the glorious liberty of His children, so far from excluding various localities, demands, rather, for its full actualization, a multiplicity of astronomic worlds, where, as in a holy temple, the divine glory is unveiled in infinite variety, according to the distinctive nature and manifold capacities of the regions of creation which have been received into the embrace of heaven. Doubtless, there is a central place—the heaven of heavens—where our ascended Lord now reigns, and where God's majestic presence is peculiarly manifested. His glory, however, is not confined within these limits, but illuminates other worlds, which thus form part of heaven.

Of this multiplicity of worlds, we have a hint in the very names employed by the Scriptures to designate heaven. שָׁמַיִם *Shamayim* is a plural, and is never used in the singular. And, since there is nothing arbitrary in language, since in primitive times names faithfully expressed the thought of the things named, the reason of this plural—which is only one of a series peculiar to the Shemitic languages—must be sought in the conception which the Hebrew mind had formed of heaven. The

plurality of the name reflects the plurality of the thing. The mind of the early age viewed heaven on its outward, local side, in the rich abundance and endless variety of the upper spaces. Of its higher, ideal side it had no thought, and, prior to the resurrection and ascension of Jesus, it could have none. But this conception, however defective, was not false; for, though heaven is *one* as regards its inner life, it is yet *many* as regards the regions which that life fills and illumines. Else why does inspiration seize upon this plural word, *Shamayim*? Would it not mislead, if there were no essential truth embodied in the word? But as *Elohim*, the plural name of God, gives an intimation of the plurality of persons in the one essence of God, so this plural name of heaven gives a like intimation of a plurality of spaces pervaded and glorified by the unique life of heaven. And so deeply rooted in the Hebrew mind was this plural idea of heaven, that the New Testament writers, by a pure Hebraism, employ the word *Ὀὐρανός* almost as often in the plural number as in the singular. It is frequently plural in the original when singular in our translation. The phrase, the kingdom of heaven, is always with Matthew, the kingdom of the heavens (*τῶν οὐρανῶν*). So in the Lord's prayer: Our Father which art in the heavens (*ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*).

It is not strange that, with these remarkable plural names, the Jewish Rabbins divided heaven into seven departments, which they severally called,—*Vilon, Rakia, Shehakim, Zebul, Maon, Makon, Araboth*. The first of these is the only one not found in the Bible. "All the rest of these names," says Tayler Lewis, "belong to the old Hebrew, and are found in the Old Testament Scriptures in such connections, as to justify the Rabbins in regarding them as denoting different regions, to say the least, in the upper spaces or heavens."\* The form which the doctrine assumed in Rabbinical hands was, indeed, fantastic, but the living germ from which it sprang is contained in the Bible, which everywhere represents heaven as a realm comprising manifold regions. The Old Testament speaks not only

\* See one of his valuable notes on Genesis in Lange's Commentary, p. 162.

of the heavens, but of the heaven of heavens, (Deut. x. 14; Psalm lxxviii. 34); and the New Testament says of Christ: "He that descended first into the lower parts of the earth is the same also that ascended up far above *all* heavens" (Ephesians iv. 10).

Having gathered from the pages of inspiration this impression of local variety in the religious unity of the celestial world, let us glance over the starry fields of space, and see whether the researches of astronomy do not lend us new confirmation. The visible creation, as it is exhibited to the eye of the astronomer, presents two grand systems, each of which is peculiarly characterized and fulfils a special purpose in the economy of the world. First, we have the *planetary* heavens. The leading idea here is that of a central luminous body of great magnitude, around which revolve, at different distances and in more or less elliptical orbits, certain other and opaque bodies,—the planets and their satellites, which, rotating about axes variously inclined, are subject to the vicissitudes of seasons and the alternations of day and night. Such is the general plan of the system to which our earth belongs,—a plan which, notwithstanding its unity, displays a large and pleasing variety, since the several members of the system, from Mercury to Neptune, present features of constitution and form peculiar to each, while all combine in the most simple and perfect harmony. This is the region of marked contrasts. In the centre rules the mighty king of day, pouring out a flood of genial light and warmth on all the bodies subject to his control; and around him servilely move his attendant vassals, bound to his throne by chains of gravitation which they cannot break. Here the darkness is separated from the light. Here there are ever varying seasons, and day follows night and night follows day.

It is evident on a moment's reflection, that the planetary orbs with their present arrangements can only be the theatre of a life that has not yet reached the full perfection of its growth. We pause not now to inquire, whether or not the other planets of our system are inhabited. It is sufficient to say that, if they are, the life which reigns in those abodes, of whatever order it

may be, vegetable, animal, or spiritual, is a life that needs a season of rest after each period of excitement, the slumber of the night after the toils of the day, the long repose of winter after the ceaseless activity of summer, a life which, in spending its forces, is liable to a greater or less degree of exhaustion, and which, therefore, demands times of inaction for recuperating its energies. No sphere that passes through the vicissitudes common to all the planets can be the native domain of an essentially incorruptible, undecaying, and immortal, because glorified, life; since the very idea of a glorified life implies that it is no longer dependent on light, sustenance, repose, and other external conditions, but that it has surmounted the limitations of its imperfect, growing stage and attained the maturity of its development. Whatever, then, may be said of the solar centres of the planetary systems, it is vain to seek for the heaven of angels or saints on any planet as now constituted.

But the astronomer points us to another and higher sphere than that of which we form so insignificant a part. It is the *sidereal system*. "Leaving Neptune and the comets, we hasten towards Sirius, burning in the depths of space, surrounded by his countless thousands of brother-stars, who all, as friendly messengers of higher and holier regions, greet us with their sparkling, glowing light. Urging our way deeper into the vaults of heaven, we behold through the telescope the milky-way, which to the naked eye appears as a faint zone of whitish lustre, resolved into millions of worlds, radiant as those we have left behind; yea, piercing still further into the unfathomable depths before us, our wandering eyes rest on thousands of nebulous clouds, floating at a distance such as mocks the scrutinizing glance of the best instruments of our day."\* We are now in the heaven of the *fixed stars*, the nearest of which is so distant that a ray of light, traveling at the rate of two-hundred thousand miles per second, requires nearly four years to speed its flight to earth, and from the farthest of the visible nebulae it could reach us only after an interval of thirty millions of

---

\* Kurtz, Bible and Astronomy. Translated by T. D. Simonton, p. 346.

years. Here we are surrounded by a world of brilliant orbs, which, unlike the planets of the solar system, refuse obedience to the sceptre of the Sun, but claim to be his compeers and form among themselves a glorious brotherhood of suns. It is a region new and strange, having constitutional arrangements and relationships widely different from those familiar to us in this lower sphere. It is possible, perhaps it is even probable, that those single stars, visible to the naked eye, which lie strewn along the celestial vault and are thought to be nearest to the earth, are solar centres of planetary systems,—systems, which in general type resemble the system of the sun, while at the same time they exclude a tedious, and monotonous uniformity in the development of the type. But when, rising higher, we mount into the regions of the double and multiple stars, the whole aspect changes. Phenomena are exhibited to which there is nothing corresponding in the cosmical regions through which the solar system moves. Here we see suns circling around suns, and the higher we ascend the more complex these astral systems become. “In the constellation of Cepheus we find one composed of four pairs of stars, and in Orion, one of three pairs bordered so closely by one of four double stars, that we are led to conclude that a union subsists between the systems of these two orders.” Within a compass as narrow as that between our sun and the nearest fixed star, not unfrequently hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions of suns revolve at a distance no greater than that which separates one planet of our system from its nearest neighbor. And what is highly remarkable is the varying strength of their light and the diversified beauty of their colors. Here glows a sun with a light of emerald green, there sparkles another with a ruby lustre; while one is tinted with a deep yellow ray, another gleams in clearest blue.

In this glorious sphere of creation, those striking contrasts, those broad antitheses, which characterize the cosmical domain we inhabit, find no place. Here there exists an oppositional relation between a solar principle on the one side, and a planetary principle on the other; the one active, the other receptive;



the former life-giving, the latter life-receiving; that constitutionally luminous, this constitutionally dark. There we observe one brilliant orb bound by ties "of close affinity and mutual sympathy" to another brilliant orb around which it moves in loving harmony, its equal in rank, though perhaps its inferior in size. In our system the prevailing relation is that of superiority and subordination between a ruling central body and smaller dependent bodies. In the fixed-star system, it is a relation of co-ordination between peers and brothers. Here the physical force of gravitation rules with despotic sway; there the same mighty force reigns, but in a higher and nobler form. "Here harmonious unity resolves itself into conflicting contrasts: night contends with day, light with darkness, heat with cold, death with life, and the body with the soul. But there all contrasts are reconciled: light and shade, day and night, are intimately united; the one shining through the other, the soul animating the body. There we find no alternation of light and darkness; a million suns at the same time shed forth the radiant light of an eternal day, yet so mildly as to avoid excess of heat no less than destructive cold. The dark material structure is pervaded and animated by a higher breath of life, and the latter through a most real and intimate union with the former attains a concrete manifestation, a vital existence, a harmonic fulness and entireness."\*

It is manifest that a sphere like this,—a sphere of cloudless sunshine and everlasting spring,—is adapted to be the theatre of a life of a widely different and vastly higher order than that which reigns in the planetary worlds. There can be no question that those upper stellar systems, if inhabited, are the seat of a life that knows no wear and tear and is subject to no exhaustion and decay. "In those worlds we seek in vain for the ominous shadows of sin and death; there we behold light without its antagonistic darkness, life without death, harmony without strife and discord, day without night, and waking

---

\* See Kurtz, *Bible and Astronomy*, p. 446—to which we acknowledge ourself largely indebted.

without sleeping.”\* They must be the abodes of a life characterized by incessant activity, since no night breaks up its busy stir and no snows or frosts benumb its energies,—a life confined to no gross bodies of flesh and blood like those of earth, weighed down by inertia and only moving with slowness and difficulty, but a life organizing for itself refined, ethereal frames, which, always fresh and always young, are the willing instruments of their animating spirits. In a word, those orbs of light must be the home of an immortal, glorified, created life.

Now the Scriptures, in their disclosures regarding the angels, reveal just such an order of life. Astronomy tells of the glory of the *home*, the Bible tells of the glory of the *inhabitants*; and between the two there is the most perfect accord. As the body corresponds to the soul, so do the peculiar features of those higher worlds answer to the peculiar features of the angelic life. Themselves bright and happy, the angels require abodes of cloudless sunshine; light and ethereal in structure, their dwelling-place must be refined and glorious; free from all distinction of sex, we should expect their homes to reflect this characteristic of their nature, and to be “free from all the physical antagonisms and oppositions, the restless and wearisome play of forces, which constitute such contrasts in our world.”

And besides, the Scriptures connect the angels with the stars in such a way as to lead us to infer that the latter are the homes of the former. The “hosts of heaven,” what are they? Sometimes the expression designates the stars of heaven (Gen. ii. 1; Deut. iv. 19; Is. xxxiv. 4; Psalm xxxiii. 6), sometimes the multitude of angels who praise the Lord and fulfil His commands (Gen. xxxii. 1, 2; Psalm ciii. 21; Psalm cxlviii. 2; 2 Kings xxii. 19.) Why this interchange of meaning, if there be no connection and correlation between the celestial orbs and the angelic ranks? So in Job we have the question:

“Where wast thou when I laid the foundation of the earth?  
When the morning stars sang together,  
And all the sons of God shouted for joy.”

---

\* Kurtz, Bible and Astronomy, p. 450.

"Here we have in addition to the sons of God celebrating the founding of the earth, the morning stars mentioned as joining in the jubilant chorus. But, according to the well-known laws of poetical parallelism in Hebrew poetry, it is necessary that the two corresponding members, "the morning stars" and the "sons of God," should be essentially connected, that they should either be identical in meaning, or, at least, be comprehended under one common idea. The morning stars are those glorious worlds of light whose undying fires ever light up the vault of heaven. What now is a more natural assumption, since the heavens are so universally represented as the dwelling-place of the angels, than that the inspired and divinely illumined poet may have regarded the sons of God as the inhabitants of these morning stars?"\*

And so says Jesus: "In my Father's house are many mansions," (John xiv. 2). Unquestionably these mansions, *μοναὶ*, are habitations, permanent dwellings, for the various members of the Father's vast family. But how shall we represent them to ourselves? Suppose them to be each a glorified world such as the earth will be after its purification by fire at the last day, and what definiteness does this give to the language of Jesus! True the Scriptures never speak of these mansions as orbs in an astronomic sense. The Bible, it cannot be too often repeated, is not a book of science, but the record of the historical revelation which God has made to man; and while the facts it sets forth may connect themselves more or less closely with the truths of science, it could not give instruction on astronomy, for example, without transcending its function and going far to defeat its own purpose as a book of life for every age and every clime. Still, it is legitimate to draw inferences from its representations; and, if there be no opposing statement of Scripture, we may infer, from what it tells us of the multiplicity of the angelic ranks and the plurality of the heavens, that many worlds—the mansions of the Father's house—constitute the mighty realm of heaven.

---

\* Kurtz, *Bible and Astronomy*, p. 224.

It is manifest from the Bible that there is a development of the heavens as well as of the earth. The heavens grow old and pass away (Ps. cii. 26 ; Is. li. 6); and again, they are renewed (2 Peter iii. 13 ; Rev. xxi. 5). Our earth awaits its renewal ; but what shall hinder us from believing that unnumbered other worlds have already attained their glorification ? "Holy writ," says Lange, "informs us clearly that, notwithstanding the changeability and necessity for regeneration of the entire universe, there is yet a contrast between the regions of growth on this side, and of perfection on the other (Ezek. i. 21 ; 1 Peter i. 4 ; 2 Peter iii. 13). In this respect the newest and purest view of the world corresponds entirely to the Biblical distinction between the regions of growth here and of perfection beyond."\* And if we should believe that only a small fraction of the stellar worlds have reached the full perfection of their growth and become transformed into fit abodes for their glorified inhabitants, still when we remember that in the milky way alone—and the milky way is but a single island in the shoreless ocean of space—there are more than thirty millions of suns, what emphasis could we lay upon the words of Jesus when He says: "In My Father's House are many mansions !"

Such is the higher heaven of the angels and the fixed stars in contrast to these lower planetary heavens. But is this the limit ? When the telescope has pierced to the outer bounds of the sidereal system, has it then reached the bounds of God's vast empire ? Is there not another and higher heaven,—a realm of life, light and glory, infinitely transcending the heaven of the fixed stars, as this transcends the planetary heavens ? Astronomy may never be able to lift the veil and give us a glimpse of its ineffable splendor, but revelation does ; and when it tells us that Christ "passed *through* the heavens" (*διελθὺς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς*, Heb. iv. 14), "ascended *above* all heavens" (*ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν*, Eph. iv. 10), and has become "*higher* than the heavens" (*ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν*, Heb. vii. 26), and yet that He was taken up visibly *into* heaven

---

\* Lange's Com. Gen. p. 184.

(εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, Acts i. 11), and "is set at the right hand of the majesty in the heavens" ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, Heb. viii. 1), we can only reconcile this verbal contradiction by assuming that there is a series of heavens rising up to the heaven of heavens, the peculiar abode of the glory of God, which is so immeasurably exalted in character above the heavens known to science that it may be truly said to be above all heavens, while, in another sense, it is the centre and inmost sanctuary of the heavens. It is a transcendent, invisible, supersensuous sphere filled with that divine glory in which the eternal Son of God dwelt prior to His manifestation in time, from which He issued forth to become incarnate for us men and our salvation, and to which, after His death and resurrection, He ascended as the glorified Son of Man. Of the constitution of that celestial world we, with our empirical notions acquired through the medium of the senses, can form but the most meagre and unworthy conception,—one, indeed, that is more negative than positive, inasmuch as we are necessitated to abstract all those conditions and limitations that prevail in this terrestrial sphere. Doubtless we should err, if we assumed that it is a world of pure, naked spirit, stript of all material vesture; for it is the home of our risen Lord who ascended to heaven clothed with our humanity, glorified, indeed, yet corporeal. It is not material, however, in the gross sense in which matter is familiar to us. All matter is in its ultimate constitution infinitely fine; even on earth it assumes the most subtile and ethereal forms. And when, therefore, it is said that God dwelleth in *light*, we are not, in the interest of a false idealism, to regard this light as unreal, but rather to view it as the medium of manifestation and communication in that loftiest realm, corresponding to, but infinitely higher than, the light that gladdens mortal eyes. So too we should err, if we thought of heaven, even the highest heaven, where Christ now has His abode, as lying mysteriously beyond the bounds of time and space; since He unites in His person the creature with the Creator, and time and space are the necessary, universal forms of creaturely existence. In themselves, however, they are pure, empty forms, obtaining their significance from the life they enshrine. Here, they are the forms of a develop-

ing life; there, the forms of a life developed. Time, in that exalted sphere, is God-filled time,—a form enclosing a positive eternity; and space, is God-filled space,—a form into which God pours the infinite fulness of His blessed life. Of this supermundane realm, the dynamic centre, the beating heart, is the God-man, Jesus Christ. He is, always was, and ever will be, its informing life. Before He became in time, by His historical incarnation, the *real* Son of Man, He was in eternity the *ideal* Son of Man, who by original determination was ever moving toward humanity (John iii. 13). He is the medium of all divine revelation, for He is the *beaming image*—*ἀπαύρασμα*—of the divine glory (Heb. i. 3). In Him the light of Godhead is concentrated and mirrored in an independent, individual, personal image, which is beamed forth from the Divine Essence and which continually beams forth its own brightness and irradiates the inner sanctuary of heaven. Indeed, this inner sanctuary, this Holy of holies, was created to be the sphere of the manifestation of Christ's glory, and it corresponds, accordingly, in constitution and form, to the divine-human life of Christ Himself. This transcendent world is to us a mystery, but none the less a glorious reality. It is evident from its exalted nature, that it must lie beyond the visible heavens and form another and higher heaven than those which science discloses to our view.

Heaven, thus, is tri-partite, threefold in its arrangement. Highest and most central stands the *Heaven of heavens*, where the glory of God comes to its serenest and clearest manifestation, since the real and ideal, nature and spirit, the creature and Creator are in perfect union and harmony. It is the sphere of absolute glorification. But the glory of this world is not confined within its own precincts. It shines forth into other and lower spheres, according to the moral development which they have attained. This interior circle is thus surrounded by a wider circle,—the *heaven of the fixed stars*, of which even astronomy enables us to affirm, that it has reached a partial and relative glorification, though its full perfect glorification is not possible according to the Bible before the final

consummation which will bring with it new heavens as well as a new earth (2 Peter iii. 13). And lastly, outside the boundaries of the sidereal heavens lie the *planetary heavens* in which our earth finds its place. Into this sphere, darkened as it is by sin and the curse, only a few broken, scattered rays of God's glory have penetrated; and not until it shall have passed through a baptism of fire will it be transformed and become the tabernacle of God with men (Rev. xxi. 3).

The justification of this view of a triple heaven rests upon the Scriptures. We have already seen that the plural names by which the celestial world is designated imply a plurality of spheres of which it is composed. We have further seen that the Bible by such expressions as the "Heaven of heavens" points definitely to a distinction of spheres. We have yet to see that the number of heavens is limited to three.

Turn to St. Paul's account of his trance (2 Cor. xii. 14). It is important to remark that this was no illusion of the Apostle's imagination, no dream woven by his fancy from the elements of Jewish superstition; but that it was a real historical occurrence by which he was, for a time, mysteriously transported to heaven. ~ Else how could he offer it, as he does, in vindication of himself? Deeming it inexpedient to boast of his labors and sufferings, Paul comes to visions and revelations from the Lord. Vision and revelation here are not separate things, as if there could be revelation without vision, or vision without revelation. They are rather two sides of one and the same thing—revelation being the objective disclosure and vision the subjective form of apprehension. Accordingly, the remarkable occurrence which he proceeds to narrate, must not be taken as a purely subjective mental vision, however true; but as an actual objective exaltation by which heaven was unveiled to him in the form of vision. He was uncertain, indeed, whether he was in the body or out of the body; but this uncertainty affects only the manner of the translation, not its reality. He did not question, that by the power of the Spirit, he was lifted up into the heavenly world; he only questioned, whether it was a rapture of the whole man, body as well as soul, or of the soul only,



apart from the body. The place into which he was rapt in his ecstasy he calls the *third* heaven (τρίτος οὐρανός), which cannot be interpreted figuratively, the number three being taken as the symbol of perfection. It is not as if the Apostle would say, "I was caught up to the sublimest heights of knowledge." This is clear from the whole context, as well as from the word employed to describe the rapture—ἀρπαγήντα,—a word which in the New Testament Greek is used of sudden, involuntary removals from one place to another, and always implies a degree of external force. There is, then, a third heaven, and that this is the last and highest of the series seems to be plainly implied in what Paul further adds, that he "heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for man to utter." The communication he received while in his ecstatic state was so mysterious in its import and so exalted in its character, that it could not be worthily expressed in the language of earth or, at least, that it would have been an awful profanation to make it known to sinful men. But where should such unutterable words be spoken, if not in the holy presence-chamber of Jehovah Himself?

The trinal division of heaven is still more definitely set forth in that portion of the Epistle to the Hebrews,\* where the author compares, and, at the same time, contrasts the Mosaic tabernacle and the heavenly sanctuary. We shall consider the passage briefly, and only so far as it has a bearing on our subject. An Outer court, a Holy place, and a Holy of holies;—such was the divinely prescribed arrangement of the ancient tabernacle. These three divisions the Jews were accustomed to compare to the three heavens; they regarded the former as miniature types of the latter, the outer court corresponding with the first heaven, the holy place with the second heaven, and the Holy of holies with the third heaven, the immediate habitation of God Himself. "The temple," says Josephus, † "has three compartments; the first two for men, the third for

---

\* Chaps. VIII.—X.

† Antiquities, Book III., Chap. 6, Sect. 4.

God, because heaven is inaccessible to men." These views, though they became grossly materialized in the rude, unthinking mind, were based upon a truth. They were derived from God's command to Moses when he was about to build the tabernacle:—"See thou make all things according to the pattern showed to thee in the Mount." The sanctuary on earth was only a shadowy type, of which the antitype is the sanctuary in heaven.

But in tracing the correspondence between the earthly and the heavenly, between the type and the antitype, care must be taken lest we form one-sided conceptions. On the one hand we must sedulously avoid that false *realism* to which the Jewish mind was prone, and into which the Rabbins fell when they supposed that God Himself had reared a model temple on Mount Sinai, where it was to exist forever; or that Moses had beheld from the sacred Mount an actual temple standing in heaven; for the relation of type and antitype is not external, consisting in outward resemblances, but internal, based upon a development of ideas. What Moses saw was a pattern structure, according to which he was to build the earthly material tabernacle,—an exact ideal model, which he beheld in prophetic vision, and which apart from his vision, had no actual existence. It was not the antitype itself, nor yet its shadowy image; it was only an ideal type and symbol, presented to his own mind, that he might be able to construct the real type and symbol for the people of Israel. The antitype is in heaven. But it would still be a false realism, were we to regard it as consisting in *heavenly localities*, outwardly viewed, and to say that as the sanctuary on earth had local compartments, so, too, has the sanctuary in heaven. That is a truth, but it is only a partial truth. The peculiarity even of the material tabernacle was not just certain local divisions as such; but it was local divisions which embodied divine ideas. The entire structure and all connected with it—compartments, furniture, and services,—was a grand symbol devised by God Himself, of spiritual relations, facts and truths.

But while we endeavor to escape this one extreme of a false

*realism*, we must be at equal pains to avoid the other extreme of a false *idealism*; and into this those Biblical commentators have fallen, who assert that *heavenly relations and Divine ideas*, as realized in Christ, constitute the archetype symbolized by the Mosaic sanctuary. The holy life of Christ, in His state of humiliation, is, according to Ebrard, the heavenly sanctuary through which Christ must pass; the rending of His body is the rending of the veil that separates Him from the Holiest of All. This view, too, contains truth, but not the whole truth. Relations and ideas are, indeed, the essential in the antitype, just as the soul is the essential in man; but as the soul receives a concrete expression in the constitution of the human body, so these relations and ideas receive a concrete expression in the constitution of the heavenly world. They must not be dualistically sundered from heavenly localities, else they lose their antitypical character.

This is manifestly the view taken by the writer of Hebrews, who not only everywhere employs imagery drawn from the earthly tabernacle, but expressly calls heaven the true tabernacle: "We have such an high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched and not man," (Heb. viii. 1-12.) All explanations, that make the tabernacle refer to something else than the heavens into which Christ has gone, and where He has sat down at the right hand of Majesty, are far-fetched and unnatural.

Since, then, the antitype is not localities, as such, nor yet ideas and relations, as such, but localities in which these ideas and relations are realized, wherein lies the correspondence between the Mosaic tabernacle and the heavenly sanctuary? The design of the tabernacle was to bring God near to His people, and to serve as a medium of communication between Him and them. Hence it is called His house, though it was in the inner of the two apartments that God specially manifested His glory. The presence chamber of Jehovah, where He revealed Himself to the High Priest, was the most Holy Place, the Place of absolute holiness. The outer apartment, separated from the inner

by a richly embroidered veil, was the Holy Place. And as the \* Most Holy Place—the peculiar abode of the divine presence—represented what God was to His people, so the Holy Place represented what they, admitted to such close communion with God, should be and do, with what graces they should be filled, and what fruits of righteousness they should exhibit. For here was the altar of incense, symbolizing the prayers of God's children, the expression of their purest and holiest affections; here was the table of shew-bread, symbolizing by its loaves the fruits of holiness; and here was the golden candlestick with its seven-fold light, symbolizing the light, which the people in fellowship with God, receive and reflect. The Holy Place is the place of a *relative* holiness. There was still needed a third place, where the people, whose guilt prevented them from entering the sacred courts of the tabernacle, might appear before Jehovah, and, by offering atoning sacrifices, avert His wrath and find reconciliation with Him. This was the Outer Court which enclosed the sanctuary, and in which stood the brazen laver and the altar of burnt-offering. It was the grand place of meeting between God and *sinful* men; and everything accordingly indicated the death and condemnation which the sinner deserves, but which has been transferred from him to the victim on the altar. The Outer Court represents a sphere which has been *darkened by sin and the curse*.

Now, everything connected with the Mosaic sanctuary was symbolical, and the reality symbolized is the heavenly sanctuary itself. Whatever pertained to that has its counterpart in this. The earthly, indeed, is only the shadowy reflection of the heavenly.

The three divisions of the temple—the Outer Court, the Holy place, and the Holy of holies—point to three grand spheres of creation, each of which is the realization in full of all the ideas, facts, and relations symbolically represented in the corresponding division of the Jewish tabernacle. The Holy of holies typifies the heaven of heavens, where God manifests His presence, not, as in the earthly temple, in theophanies and the light-cloud, but in the fulness of His life. This is that sphere of perfect

glory, the third, the highest heaven, into which Christ, our great High Priest, has entered,—and He alone, as the Jewish High Priest, of whom Christ is the prototype, alone went into the earthly Holy of holies. “Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself now to appear in the presence of God for us” (Heb. ix. 24; cf. Heb. viii. 1; ix. 12). And His presence there was foreshadowed by the cherubim which overspread the Mercy-seat, and which were *symbols* of the highest properties of created life as the outgoings and manifestations of the divine life, and at the same time *types* of our glorified humanity in which these properties were to be combined and exhibited.\* They point to the Divine Son of Man, the mediator of every divine revelation.

The Holy Place indicates no less clearly a sphere of *relative glorification*. And what is this but *the heaven of the angels*, who having passed their probation and entered upon a life of confirmed holiness, already enjoy the first-fruits of their glory in those orbs of light which they inhabit; but who yet await their full glorification which is dependent on the redemption of humanity, and the final consummation when God shall be all in all? In it were offered, not bloody sacrifices, but the sacrifices of thanksgiving and praise, adumbrated by the incense, the light, and the loaves. And in the archetypal Holy Place, the angelic heaven, there is no expiation for sin, but only such sacrifices as may be presented to God by children who are in the most intimate and blessed communion with Him. Still the Holy Place was separated from the Holy of Holies by a veil, signifying in a shadowy way that the full glory of God's heaven does not yet penetrate and fill the angelic heaven, spotless as is the purity of this; but that these beatified spirits look with longing to the future, when the veil shall be withdrawn and they shall stand amid the burning splendors of God's throne. Through this second heaven Jesus passed on His triumphal way to the highest heaven, just as the High Priest in entering the

---

\* Fairbairn's Typology, p. 196.

Most Holy Place had necessarily to pass through the Holy Place. He, we are told, is our Great High Priest who passed through the heavens (*διεληλυθὼτα τοὺς οὐρανούς*, Heb. iv. 14); and in another chapter the author expressly calls that through which Jesus passed a tabernacle, and distinguishes it from the Holy of holies (*τὰ ἅγια*, Heb. ix. 12), into which He entered. "But Christ having appeared as High Priest of the good things to come, through the greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this creation, nor yet through blood of goats and calves, nay rather through His own blood, entered once for all into the holy places and obtained eternal redemption for us."\* If we interpret this "greater and more perfect tabernacle" of Christ's body, or of His holy life, or of His Church, we become involved in inextricable confusion; but if we interpret it of a great cosmical sphere, the heaven of the angels, lying between the heaven of heavens above and the planetary heavens below, we give to the language a clear and natural sense which harmonizes with the epistle throughout, and preserves the true relation between the type and the antitype.

But before Jesus ascended He offered Himself a sacrifice for sin. Bloody sacrifices were offered, not in the Holy Place, much less in the Most Holy Place, but in the Outer Court. And as the two divisions of the tabernacle refer to two distinct spheres of creation, so, too, must the Outer Court find its counterpart in a definite cosmical region. What is that? We cannot err when we say that it is the earth and the planetary system with which it stands connected. For all that relates to the Outer Court points to a realm on which sin has cast its baleful shadow,—to our world and the several members of the planetary system, which, being organically bound to the earth, participate in the mournful consequences of its fall.

Thus there are three grand spheres, differing in their glory:—the highest sphere a realm of absolute glory, the habitation of God and His Incarnate Son; the second sphere, a realm which has attained a relative glorification, the home of the

---

\* Heb. ix. 11, 12, Alford's translation.

angels; and the third sphere, a realm where as yet only a few scattered rays of glory have broken through the darkness of the curse, the dwelling-place of fallen humanity. The separation of the second and third spheres from the glory of the first, was typically represented by the two veils of the tabernacle; and the rending of the veil at the crucifixion pointed not exclusively to the death of the Son of God, but to a redemptive movement which began with the crucifixion, but which will not reach its conclusion till the regeneration at the last day. The ascension of Jesus Christ, the entrance of our Great High Priest into the heavenly Holy of Holies, is not of merely soteriological import, but has (as we learn more especially from the epistles to the Colossians and the Ephesians) a cosmical significance. "Exalted above the limitations of time and space, He reveals Himself now eternally as the Head of the *Kingdom of grace*; a kingdom which is not only the centre and goal of all human history, but which embraces within its range the world of spirits also; that kingdom of grace which is to take up into itself and to glorify the entire kingdom of nature, and thus become in the end one universal kingdom of glory."\* And though the heaven of the angels is already partially glorified, yet as the several spheres of creation constitute one vast organism, it follows that even their consummation of glory is not possible until the work of redemption is fully accomplished. Then, when Christ shall have put all enemies under His feet, and not before, will the veils of separation be removed, and the glory of the inner heaven will fill and illumine the outer heavens, and God will be All in All (2 Cor. xv. 24-28).

Here, for the present, we must close, hoping to take up the second and more important part of our subject in a future number.

---

\* Martensen's Dogmatics, Eng. Translation, p. 315.



## ART. VII.—THE PILOT.\*

On broad-spread pinions circling grand,  
Aloft, the eagle views the land,  
And as the lightning cleaves its way,  
Down flashes he to clutch his prey;  
With mighty sweeps then mounts the sky,  
And fades to a speck before the eye,  
E'en while his bloodless war-scream thrills  
The startled echoes of the hills.  
Thus, on the broad main's heaving breast,  
Slow cruising round in watchful quest,  
The pilot spies on th' horizon's rim  
A stately ship, slow nearing him,  
While from her fore-mast's giddy peak  
Her signal doth a pilot speak.

"A ho!" he cries, "spread every sail!"  
His schooner sweeps before the gale.  
As from the bow the arrow flies,  
As shoots a meteor through the skies,  
Beneath the wide-spread snow-white sail,  
So speed his boat before the gale.  
The dark-blue waters, keenly cleft,  
Do foam and flash to right and left;  
And dashing high before the prow  
A thousand sparkling diamonds show,—  
That gleam one moment in the sun,  
Then yield a life but just begun,  
Light falling back into the sea,  
Whence late they sprang so cheerily.  
And with the wind that freshening blew,  
Yet swifter on the Pilot flew.  
On, by the lonely light-house tower,  
Which through the dark and midnight hour,  
So silently with kindly ray,  
Oft lit the anxious mariner's way;  
On, by the headlands' craggy rock,  
At whose black base with ceaseless shock,

\* The Pilots cruise slowly about the mouth of the harbor, watching for the approach of any vessel that may need their aid. No sooner is one spied by them, than they immediately make sail and steer toward her. Often two, three, or more will start for the same ship. Their success, then, depends upon the rapidity with which they can sail. Often the most exciting races ensue, for he who first reaches the vessel is engaged to pilot her into harbor.

With quick advance, and quick retreat,  
The surging waters thundering beat ;  
By lazy fishers' idle smack ;  
Across some great bark's bubbling track ;  
Before the blast, and through the spray,  
He lightly cut his rolling way.  
From gurge to crest, from crest to gurge,  
His flying boat he on doth urge ;  
Beneath the sail she now doth reel,  
And leaping onward shines her keel ;  
She caps the crest, then sinks from view,  
And dashes bold the billows through,  
That rising high, the bows before,  
Now on the deck in torrents pour.  
The sea is high, and shrilling loud,  
The winds do pipe through sail and shroud ;  
He heeds it not, a sail in view,  
His onward course he will pursue.  
The heavy thunders loud may roll,  
And flash their fires from pole to pole,  
He, dashing onward with the wind,  
Leaves both his wake and fear behind.  
As fearless he, when boding harm  
Comes o'er the wave the whirling storm,  
And low the heavens lower down  
O'er seas that well return the frown ;  
As when upon a still blue sky  
The silvery clouds asleep do lie,  
And troubled oceans sullen roar  
In murmurs low is heard no more,  
And infant breakers full of glee  
Chase one another laughingly.  
And gaily now he onward past,  
Swept by the deep and roaring blast ;  
Borne on and tossed upon the swell,  
As lightly as a cockle shell.  
He scans the sea with anxious brow  
To mark his rival's plunging prow,  
Hauls yet more taut the humming rope,  
And tells his speed with quickening hope ;  
Now rises on the mighty mound  
Till he discerns the ocean's round ;  
Then downward sinks with rushing sweep  
Into the ocean gully deep,

Until the mounting waters high  
Shut out both land, and sea, and sky.  
To claim the prize each nerve he strains;  
On! as fleet courser spurns the plains;  
He nears! he nears! is hailed with joy;  
He speeds to aid, and not destroy.

The Captain now resigns command  
Into the pilot's skillful hand,  
Who safely steers by rock and shoal  
Directly to the wished-for goal.  
And soon the ship in harbor fast,  
The seamen rest; all danger past.

---

ART. VIII.—THE FORTY DAYS AFTER THE RESURRECTION.

---

BY REV. JOHN M. TITZEL, A.M., EMMITSBURG, M.D.

---

THE triumph of Christ over death and hades involved in it His ascension to the right hand of God the Father Almighty. His resurrection was not merely like that of Lazarus a restoration to the same order of life in which He moved before His crucifixion, but a real overcoming of death by which His humanity was entirely freed from its dominion, raised to a higher state of existence, and thus in the fullest sense exalted and glorified. After His resurrection, accordingly, the earth in its fallen and corrupt condition was no longer a fit abode for Him, and His ascension became necessary in order that the sphere of His life and being might be in perfect harmony with His nature. Besides, the full accomplishment of His mediatorial work required His exaltation to the right hand of the Majesty on high. He must needs go to the Father that the Holy Ghost, the Lord, the Giver of life, might come to the children of men. So He Himself declared to His disciples just before His death. "It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you" (John xvi. 7). Only through His ascension was the way opened up for the bestow-

ment of the Pentecostal gift, without which none of His followers could ever "come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ" (Eph. iv. 13).

Yet Christ did not immediately on His resurrection ascend up on high. On the contrary He tarried for forty days on the earth before He took His final departure from His disciples and was received up into heaven. And these forty days are among the most mysterious of His whole life here below. During this time His relations to the present world were very different from what they were before His death. He did not now appear publicly among men, but only showed Himself openly "unto witnesses chosen before of God" (Acts x. 41). Though seen occasionally by His disciples, and engaged in instructing them, yet He was not constantly accompanied by them. His body, although capable of being handled and of partaking of food, was, nevertheless, no longer subject to the same laws as those of common men, but was endued with new powers, properties and attributes. He was possessed of the capability of rendering Himself, at will, sometimes visible and sometimes invisible; and we read that "when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you" (John xx. 19). Thus He continued on earth, working miracles and holding discourses with His disciples, until having accomplished His purposes, "He led them out as far as Bethany, and He lifted up His hands and blessed them; and it came to pass while He blessed them, He was parted from them and carried up into heaven" (Luke xxiv. 50).

When we seriously consider all these facts we are naturally led to inquire, what was the object of Christ's remaining in this way on earth for so long a time? Of what significance were these forty days for the Person of Christ Himself, and for His Church? In view of the little information we have explicitly given us on this subject in the Sacred Scriptures, it would be useless as well as presumptuous, for us to endeavor to give a full and satisfactory answer to these questions, yet we

believe that they may properly and profitably claim some consideration.

That the forty days after His resurrection and before His ascension had some special significancy for the Person of Christ Himself, cannot, we think, be reasonably questioned. This necessarily follows from the relation in which Christ stands to His own work. He came into the world to save sinners—to redeem men from the curse of the law, and to open unto them the gates of everlasting glory. This, however, He did not do by interposing in a merely outward way between God and man, but by assuming the nature of man and so becoming capable of being “in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin” (Heb. iv. 15). “The word was made flesh and dwelt among us” (John i. 14). He “who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men” (Phil. ii. 6, 7). And He thus took part of flesh and blood, as has, already been intimated that “through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage” (Heb. ii. 14, 15). “Being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross;—*wherefore*,” St. Paul tells us, “God also hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name” (Phil. ii. 8, 9). His death accordingly led to His exaltation. And what is true of His death is equally true of all He endured and suffered in the state of His humiliation. His lowly birth, His circumcision, His presentation in the temple, His flight into Egypt, His obscure labors as a common carpenter in the despised village of Nazareth, His baptism, His fasting and temptation in the wilderness, the oppositions and hatreds of men to which He was exposed during His public ministry, as well as His sufferings in Gethsemane and on Calvary, all looked primarily to His glorification. He was subjected to none of these things merely that He might set us an example as to how we should act in the various circumstances of life, but because these

things were in some way necessary to the proper development and perfecting of His humanity. "For it became Him, for whom are all things and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings" (Heb. ii. 10).

So too, His miracles and teachings prior to His crucifixion looked to His glorification. They were but, so to speak, the natural outgoings of His life, brilliant rays of light proceeding from His person, manifesting forth His glory, and preparing the way for His return to heaven. Everything pertaining to the life of Christ before His death, therefore, had significance for His own Person. But this, we think, must be held to be true also of what relates to His life during the forty days immediately subsequent to His resurrection. For, though His resurrection was a decided turning-point in His life, yet it was only the beginning of a higher development which completed itself in the ascension. His glorified corporeal nature budded in the former, but only expanded into full bloom in the latter. We cannot, therefore, believe that He lingered on earth during the forty days only in condescension to the needs of His disciples. This period of His earthly sojourn must have had something to do with the consummation of His glorification.

In what particular manner, however, during these forty days the process of glorification was carried forward in the Person of Christ, is a holy mystery which it is not possible for us to penetrate in our present state, and which, therefore, must remain inscrutable to us so long as we sojourn in the flesh. But this is true in a greater or less degree of everything pertaining to the Person and life of our blessed Lord. The very constitution of His Person itself is a profound mystery which we can contemplate only with awe. How He can be the Son of God and at the same time the Son of Man, very God of very God, and yet bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, is to us past finding out. So, too, it is utterly impossible for us fully to understand why it was necessary for Him to be circumcised and to be baptized, and how He could be tempted and suffer and die! What awful mysteries the prayer in Gethsemane and the

cry uttered on the cross! Yet these things we might rather expect to be able to understand, than those things which pertain to the forty days after the resurrection, since they occurred within the sphere of our present life, while those belong to a sphere altogether transcending that in which we now live and move and have our being.

But though we may not know in what special way the Person of our Lord was affected during the period of His life we are engaged in considering, yet we may be allowed to assume that during this time such a development took place in His corporeal nature as made complete room for the full glorification of His humanity in the ascension. Accordingly, the great forty days were for Christ Himself a transition period—a preparation for His exaltation and session at the right hand of God. They stand, therefore, related to His glorified life somewhat as the forty days of His fasting and temptation in the wilderness do to the work of His public ministry, and as the forty days preceding His presentation in the temple do to the whole of His life on earth. They constituted, in other words, the proper prelude to his entrance upon that higher stage of the mediatorial work in which He is now engaged, enthroned in heaven, and from henceforth expecting till His enemies be made His footstool. Something like this seems to be plainly taught in the Sacred Scriptures. Thus we are informed in the Gospel according to St. John, that immediately after His resurrection Jesus said unto Mary Magdalene, "Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father; but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father, and to my God and your God." (John xx. 17.) Two things, we think, are clearly implied in these words: *First*, that Christ was, at that time, not yet fully glorified, and, *secondly*, that His glorification was then already in the process of accomplishment. And as this process must have been from that which was within to that which was without, we may further assume that the Spirit in a manner altogether incomprehensible to us was progressively penetrating its body, and conforming it to itself, and so making it, in the fullest sense of the term, a spiritual body.



Christ entered the world, however, not simply as a man, but as the man—as the true head of the race. He came as the second Adam to repair, by His obedience, the ruin occasioned by the disobedience of the first Adam, and to bring life and immortality to light. What things, accordingly, He endured and achieved—His sufferings and His triumphs—all have significance not only for Himself, but also for others. Primarily, indeed, all looks to Himself. The reconciliation of God and man is first effected in His own Person. He made atonement and first realized its fruits in His resurrection and ascension, just as Adam after transgressing the law of God first realized the consequences of his transgression. And as the consequences of Adam's sin, because of his representative relation, have reached all his posterity, and even brought the whole creation into bondage, so do the results of Christ's work, also, for the same reason, extend to every creature, whether in heaven or in earth. The forty days after the resurrection were, therefore, not only of great account for the Person of Christ Himself, but also for His Church, which is His body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all.

If now we inquire into the significance of this period of Christ's life for the Church, we shall find it to be very great. In some respects, indeed this portion of His terrestrial existence is the most important of all, as finally preparing the way for the actual establishment of the Church, and as giving us unquestionable evidence of that which in fact was the foundation of all Apostolic preaching, and which alone gives reality to our faith and hope. It was for the Church a period in which inexhaustible supplies were being furnished for her future nourishment, as well as a period of bloom which immediately preceded the appearance of the actual fruit of salvation in the outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost.

One object, therefore, it cannot be doubted, of our Lord's gracious delay for forty days on earth, was to establish by abundant and decisive testimony the reality of His resurrection. That this should be thus established was of immense importance for the disciples, as, it is for us also, who have come after them.

For the whole work of Christ hinges on His resurrection. It was necessary that He should die that He might redeem the world, but it was just as necessary that He should rise again. Had death holden Him, had the sepulchre kept His body and hades retained His soul, had the stone not been rolled away from the former and the gates of the latter not been burst asunder, then would He have endured all His sufferings for nought, and every hope of redemption been destroyed. "If Christ be not risen," says St. Paul, "then is our preaching vain and your faith is also vain, ye are yet in your sins" (1 Cor. xv. 14, 17). "But it was not possible that He should be holden of death" (Acts ii. 24). "His soul was not left in hell, neither His flesh did see corruption" (Acts ii. 31). "He broke the gates of brass and cut the bars of iron in sunder" (Ps. cvii. 16), and arose triumphant from the tomb. Moreover, He was "declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead" (Rom. i. 4). It was necessary, however, that His disciples should be assured of this fact, and, consequently, that He should show Himself alive to them after His passion by many infallible proofs. Only in this way could they be properly prepared to receive Him when He should spiritually come unto them through the Holy Ghost.

Had Jesus not showed Himself alive to His disciples after His death, but immediately on His resurrection ascended up on high, their faith in Him as the promised Messiah must have failed them. Though they might not have been able under such circumstances to account satisfactorily for the disappearance of His body from the tomb, yet they could not have felt sure that He had vanquished death and forever destroyed its power. Especially, in the state of mind in which they were at the time, they must have soon come to look upon His cause as a lost cause, and so felt themselves compelled to return to their ordinary occupations and end their life in disappointment. They would no doubt have long continued to ponder on His divine teachings and marvellous works, and to call to mind with sorrow the awful and mysterious tragedy of His crucifixion;

but they must also have come more and more to believe that they were mistaken in acknowledging Him as "the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Mat. xvi. 16). In this way their faith in Jesus as the Redeemer of Israel must have been dissipated, and they would have come to look upon Him as having been at most only "a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people" (Luke xxiv. 19).

But faith in Him as the Redeemer of His people was required on their part that they might receive the Holy Ghost and so come to know Christ savingly. For "the righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith—as it is written, the just shall live by faith" (Rom. i. 17). In other words, faith alone is the organ by which man can truly apprehend those things which pertain to the kingdom of God. It was, consequently, as indispensable to the immediate disciples of Jesus, as it is to us. In order, however, that their faith might be properly awakened and sustained there was need that the reality of Christ's resurrection should be demonstrated to them in such a way as to leave no room for reasonable doubt on their part. Why this should be so, it is not difficult to understand, as thus only, so far as we can see, could Christ, under existing circumstances, verify to them the truthfulness of His prediction that on the third day he should arise, and give them indubitable proof of His victory over death and hades.

But that the reality of Christ's resurrection should be established by ample testimony was no less necessary for us than for the disciples. The nature of our relation to Christ is conditioned by this fact as well as was theirs. And this in a two-fold way. In the first place, by their faith in its reality, without which ours would not have been possible. Had they not been placed as foundation stones in the temple of the Lord there would be nothing for us to be builded on. In the second place, by the proof of its reality, which awakened and strengthened their faith. This also is a support to our faith. So much so, indeed, is this the case, that if even now the original testimony in favor of Christ's resurrection could be successfully invalidated, it would go far, notwithstanding the powerful

argument afforded by the success of the Gospel for its divinity, to destroy all faith in it as the power of God unto salvation. The importance, therefore, that ample testimony should have been given of the reality of the resurrection of Jesus cannot well be over-estimated.

Now, in the events of the forty days during which He tarried on the earth after His resurrection, our Lord has given us just such testimony as was needed firmly to establish the fact of His triumph over death. During that time He showed Himself to His disciples by infallible proof to be alive. He manifested Himself to them not only once, but a number of times. Not less than ten appearances of Him are recorded in the Sacred Scriptures. Five of these, it is true, occurred on the same day in which He arose, but not to the same persons always, nor under the same circumstances.

First He appeared to Mary Magdalene as she was standing near the sepulchre, sorrowing because she saw that His sacred body was no longer there, and as yet was ignorant of what disposition had been made of it. Not recognizing Him, in her perplexity, she addressed Him, taking Him to be the gardener, and only knew that it was He whose body she was seeking when He said unto her, "Mary." Shortly after, the other ministering women who had conveyed the first tidings of the empty tomb to the Apostles, were permitted to meet their Lord face to face, and to clasp the holy feet before which they had cast themselves down to worship. Next He appeared unto Simon, but under what circumstances we are not told. Then He joined the company of His two followers, who were on their way to Emmaus, talking together, as they went along, about the strange events which had lately transpired. Their eyes being holden, they did not know Him as He walked with them and expounded to them the Scriptures concerning Himself. But when sitting at meat with them, He took bread, and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them, their eyes were opened and they knew Him (Luke xxiv. 30, 31). The evening of the same day, when the disciples were assembled together and were joyfully conversing about what they had heard and seen,

the doors being shut for fear of the Jews, Jesus unexpectedly "stood in the midst of them and saith, Peace be unto you" (Luke xxiv. 36). And they being affrighted, supposing Him to be a spirit, He, in order to assure them of His bodily presence, requested them to handle Him, and did eat before them, and opened their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures (Luke xxiv. 37—45). A week later, He, in like manner, appeared again in the midst of His disciples, as they were assembled together within closed doors, and this time convinced the doubting Thomas, who before was not present, of the reality of the resurrection of His body, which had been nailed to the cross and subsequently laid in the new rock-hewn tomb of Joseph of Arimathea. Some time afterwards, but how long we have no way of determining, Jesus showed Himself again to seven of His disciples at the sea of Tiberias. During this appearance He wrought a miracle in their behalf, dined with them, and foretold by what death Peter should glorify God. A few days were permitted to pass, and then Jesus once more manifested Himself; and this time, even as He had promised on the morning of the resurrection, on a mountain in Galilee, probably that of the Beatitudes, to the eleven chosen disciples and above five hundred brethren. It was then, we have every reason to believe, that He declared unto them that all power was given unto Him in heaven and in earth, and gave them their great evangelical commission to make disciples of all nations, assuring them at the same time that He would be with them alway, even unto the end of the world. Subsequently, He appeared, St. Paul tells us, unto James, but where and under what circumstances we know not. Finally, just before His ascension, He manifested Himself to all His Apostles in the neighborhood of Jerusalem, on Mount Olivet, where He revealed His last will and intentions. "And when He had spoken these things, while they beheld, He was taken up; and a cloud received Him out of their sight" (Acts i. 9).

That these appearances and their attending circumstances afforded ample proof to the Apostles of the resurrection of

Christ, is evident from the fact that they never afterwards doubted it, but always affirmed it in the most positive manner in their preaching, and witnessed it by their death. Nor is the testimony of the fact any less decisive for us. Had Christ only appeared once to His disciples, or had He always appeared under the same circumstances, we might, perhaps, reasonably doubt whether they were not deceived. But when we consider all the testimony in the case, we can find no proper ground for such doubt. The appearances were so numerous, and the circumstances so varied, that every supposition of illusion on the part of the disciples would be unreasonable. Equally untenable is the supposition that the Apostles were impostors, or that the accounts which have come down to us are mythical. Thus far, indeed, the most hostile criticism has entirely failed in successfully invalidating the evidence which the Sacred Scriptures furnish us in the Gospel history of the resurrection of our blessed Lord. So firmly did He establish the fact during the great forty days. And may we not believe that He did so, because, in His infinite wisdom, He saw aforesaid what terrible assaults in future ages would be made upon this impregnable foundation of all our hopes!

But another object which our Lord had in remaining so long a time on earth after His resurrection, we can scarcely doubt, was more fully to reveal the character of His Person and of His kingdom, and to give such proofs of the nature of both as would meet the needs of the church in all ages, in her conflict with the world, the flesh, and the devil. Especially, during this period of His terrestrial existence, does He give incontrovertible evidence that He is the Son of God, and that His kingdom is not of this world.

It is questionable whether the disciples of our Lord had any clear, full consciousness of His divinity until after His crucifixion. They knew Him to be man, bone of their bone, and flesh of their flesh, and like unto them in all things, sin only excepted. And this was important, as it was necessary that the Redeemer should be human, and be known as such. They, too, must have had some dim perception of His divine character.

This is, indeed, clearly implied in the confession of Peter: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Matt. xvi. 16). But that they did not fully realize all that was involved in this confession is evident from the astonishment which they continually manifested when He performed any of His wonderful works, and from the despondency to which they gave way when He was betrayed into the hands of His enemies and crucified. After His ascension, however, we find a great change in them in this respect. They are no longer astonished by the displays of His divine power, or given to despondency, but ever ready to proclaim and worship Him as God. And this change we have every reason to believe was in a great measure brought about through their intercourse with Him during the forty days. Every thing connected with this intercourse was of such a character as to impress upon them His divinity, and yet in such a manner as not to destroy their faith in His humanity. And as it was indispensable to His character as Mediator that He should be, and be known to be, Divine as well as human, the period of His life which we are now considering was the necessary complement of that which preceded it. But for the schooling which it afforded the disciples, it would be difficult to understand how they could ever have come fully to realize that Jesus was "very God of very God," and yet "incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary and made man;" and, consequently, how the Church could ever have been actually founded. Nor are the facts given us in the Sacred Scriptures concerning this portion of the life of Christ unimportant in this respect to us of the present day. On the contrary, it is only as we make proper account of them, that we can attain to any clear knowledge of the Person of our blessed and adorable Lord.

But the Apostles, before the death of Christ, not only had imperfect views of the Person of Christ, but also of the nature of the kingdom He came to establish. The common Jewish expectation with regard to the Messiah at the time was that He would deliver Israel from the yoke of foreign bondage, and set up a temporal kingdom like those around them, but surpassing them all in splendor and glory. And this expectation the disci-



ples shared, in a measure, with the rest of the people. They had no proper conception of the Messiah's kingdom as spiritual, and not of this present world. So little, indeed, did they seem to realize its true character, that near the close of His public ministry Jesus found it necessary to say in reply to the request made by the mother of Zebedee's children and her sons, that they might have the chief place in His kingdom, "Ye know not what ye ask" (Math. xx. 22). Hence, they were continually given to misunderstanding the actions and teachings of their Lord, and not unfrequently, indeed, marvellously incapable of apprehending the clear import of His words.

Now nothing, we conceive, could possibly have been better suited to correct their erroneous notions, and help them to understand aright the life and sayings of Jesus, and the true character of His reign, than their intercourse with Him during the time intervening between the resurrection and the ascension. The altogether different nature of His corporeal existence must plainly have taught them that His kingdom was not of the same order with the kingdoms of this world, and thus prepared them to understand that a great change must be effected in men, and new heavens and a new earth take the place of those that now are, before it could be established in all its fullness and glory. Nor could anything have been better calculated to keep them from falling into the opposite error of supposing that His kingdom was merely a moral kingdom, and spiritual in such a sense as not to include corporeity. The fact that though it was in many respects very different from what it had been, He, nevertheless, still possessed the same body which had been nailed to the cross, and that He did not lay it aside, but took it with Him to heaven, could scarcely have failed to impress them with the truth that the redemption which He purchased for us embraces the body as well as the soul, and that both have a place in the kingdom of God.

In the way, therefore, of correcting and perfecting their views of Christ's kingdom, the experience of the disciples during the forty days must have been of the greatest value to them. And in the same way it has significancy for us who have come after

them. The erroneous views which they at first entertained seem to be natural to man in his fallen and corrupt state, and, consequently, they are continually manifesting themselves in his thinking and actions. In our times, no less than in the times of Christ, men need to be taught that the true end of life cannot be reached in the present world, but lies beyond it in an order which is supernatural, and that, except a man be born again, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. The ignorance exhibited by Nicodemus in his interview with Jesus is still found among professed masters in Israel, and the false hopes cherished by the great body of the Jewish people have not yet ceased to be entertained. The great expectations of a good time coming, built by so many in our days upon what they suppose will be the final results of Scientific discovery, are substantially the same thing. All rest on the assumption that in the present order of the world a state of human perfection may be reached. But who that makes proper account of the facts of Christ's life, and especially of those pertaining to that portion of it we are considering, can fail to feel that all these expectations are but empty dreams which sooner or later must vanish away. Why may we not then believe that one object of Christ's tarrying on earth after His resurrection was to reveal to us, as well as to His disciples, something of the sphere in which we at last shall reach our true destination, and attain to the perfection of being for which men in all ages have been longing and to which in some form, or other, they have ever been looking forward?

But, it cannot be doubted also, that still another object which Christ had in view in His delay to ascend to the right hand of the Majesty on high, was fully to prepare His Apostles for the discharge of their public office. This He did in part, indeed, in the way already indicated. But besides demonstrating to them by infallible proof the reality of His resurrection, and so revealing to them at the same time the true nature of His Person and kingdom, He also imparted to them special instruction. Thus we are told, that "beginning at Moses and all the prophets, He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things

concerning Himself" (Luke xxiv. 27), and that He opened their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures" (Luke xxiv. 45). All this, of course, must have been of immense account to them, in helping them properly to interpret the Old Testament, which is the true substratum of the New, and in thus preparing them to be the guides and instructors of those who have come after them.

Christ, however, during this period did not only favor His disciples with expositions of the prophecies, but also made special revelations to them of those things which it was still necessary for them to know with regard to the kingdom which He had come to establish. St. Luke explicitly informs us that during this time He was engaged in "Speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God" (Acts i. 3). Of recorded sayings, it is true, there are but few, but they are all of signal and peculiar importance, and no one who carefully studies them can fail to realize that they must have been of the greatest consequence to those to whom they were primarily addressed, as they still continue to be also to us. In some respects we may say that they are the most important of all the sayings of our Lord which have come down to us, as they contain in germ everything most precious to Christians, in knowledge, privilege, and comfort, and constitute, so to speak, the charter of the kingdom—of the kingdom which from a mustard-grain was to grow into a mighty tree and overshadow the earth.

Then, too, it was during these forty days that Christ, after proclaiming His royal prerogative by announcing that "all power was given unto Him in heaven and in earth" (Matt. xxviii. 18), commissioned His disciples in these words of solemn authority: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them all things which I have commanded you, and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen." (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20). During this period also it was, that "He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: and whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they

are retained" (John xx. 22, 23). That these words conveyed real power and authority to the disciples, we think, unquestionable. They constituted their full investiture with the Apostolic office, an investiture with which Christ could not clothe them until after His resurrection. Before His death, He did, indeed, say unto them, "Whatsoever ye *shall bind* on earth, *shall be bound* in heaven" (Matt. xviii. 18); but now He says, "Whose soever sins ye *remit*, they *are remitted* unto them." The former words were *prospective*, but the latter imparted authority in fact and reality. Their importance, therefore, to the disciples in fitting them for the great work of the ministry to which they were called, must appear evident to all who do not change the whole life and work of Christ into an unreality and make it a mere sham.

In all the ways now pointed out, we think, it must be generally felt and admitted, that Christ's tarrying on the earth after His resurrection has been of great account to His Church, but we would yet add, that it also has significancy for her in that it is a pledge that the Kingdom of God shall be gloriously established even on the earth. Just before His ascension, when His disciples asked, "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom of Israel?" though He told them, "It is not for you to know the time or the season, which the Father hath put in his own power" (Acts i. 6, 7), yet He did not deny that their hopes were well founded, but confirmed them. And immediately after Jesus had taken His final departure from them, and while they were still looking steadfastly towards heaven, two angel-visitors who stood by them in white apparel said unto them, "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus which is now taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven" (Acts i. 11).

Not forever, therefore, shall Sin and Death hold high carnival here on earth. The time will come when their power shall utterly pass away and their reign forever cease. "The creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God" (Rom.

viii. 21). "The meek shall inherit the earth" (Matt. v. 5). The truth hidden in the Jewish notion of an earthly Messianic kingdom, in the dreams of poets, and in the modern doctrine of man's Perfectibility, shall be realized in a kingdom of whose glory there shall be no end. But this kingdom will be fully established only when the Son of Man cometh in the glory of His Father with the holy angels, and after the earth shall have passed through a death-struggle and from its grave shall have arisen to a higher and more glorious form of existence.

---

ART. IX.—THE PERICOPES, OR SELECTIONS OF GOSPELS  
AND EPISTLES FOR THE CHURCH YEAR.

---

NO. IV.

---

BY E. E. HIGBEE, D.D., MERCERSBURG, PA.

---

THE order of the post-trinity pericopes which meets us in the Roman Catholic Church seems to have been very much disturbed. It neither follows the Liber Comitatus, nor conforms itself, so far as we have been able to discover, to any of the ancient lectionaria. The gospel and epistle selections, it is true, are the same generally as those in the old lectionaria; but they are differently distributed and arranged for the Sundays, and in some cases the same gospel and epistle are not joined together as in the old order. This disjointure is thus commented upon by Daniel: "Quod ad pericopas (referring to those after Pentecost) retinet ecclesia Lutherana vetustum ordinem, ad sæculum usque xvi. in omnibus fere ecclesiis observatum. Contra pericoparum ordo apud Catholicos valde turbatus est: nunquam enim ea epistola juncta est Evangelio, quam antiqui cum pericopa evangelica junxere. Itaque in vanum laborant, qui his Dominicis epistolam cum Evangelio *πνευματικῶν* quodam commercio cohærere ostendere conantur." (Codex Lit. Tom. ii. in append.) We notice also a reference to the same fact by

Gavanti, in the following statement: "In sequentibus Dominicis post Pentecosten aliqua est varietas Evangeliorum respectu antiquorum, non modo quoad ordinem, quia in primis Dominicis mutatus est ordo Evangeliorum, verum etiam quoad sedem Dominicalem: quia Evangelium, quod legebatur Dominica quinta post Pentecosten, de captura piscium miraculosa, hodie legitur Dominica quarta: quod alias Dominica sexta, nunc Dominica quinta, et sic deinceps ad Dominicam primam ultra vigesimam." (Comm. in Rubr. Missalis, Pars iv. Tit. xii. 13.)

At this time we do not wish to investigate this fact. Without taking into view, therefore, the disturbance referred to, and without entering into any comparative survey of the various lectionaria, we propose to examine only the selections which meet us in our "Order of Worship," as these are in full conformity with those which ruled almost universally in the older lectionaria.\*

We begin with the sixth Sunday after Trinity. The gospel selection here (St. Matt. v. 20, 26) brings into view that which is to characterize the ethical life of the Christian Church, and this in sharp contrast with the moral condition of the Scribes and Pharisees. The *law of love*, the νόμος τέλειος ὁ τῆς ἐλευθερίας of St. James, looking into and abiding in which, the Christian at once transcends the whole order of worldly morality, and the whole legalism and casuistry of Scribes and Pharisees;—this law of love is now a theme of meditation, summing

\* The selections in the "Order of Worship" are the same as those attributed to the Lib. Com. by Daniel in his "*Pericoparum Conspectus*." It is impossible, from the copy of the Lib. Com. which I have, to verify the Conspectus of Daniel in reference to the Sundays with which we begin this article; for in it, from the sixth Sunday after Pentecost, no Sundays are given, until the Sunday is reached which is called "Dominica post natale apostolorum," the selections for which are the same as meet us in the "order of worship," for the eighth Sunday after Trinity. It is evident, however, that two Sundays have been omitted in this copy; for the "xiv. Kal Jul." follows immediately after the sixth Sunday from Pentecost. Now, counting from this xiv. Kal. Jul. to the Sunday following the festival of the Apostles, (this festival occurring on the iii. Kal. Jul. or June 29th,) we have the time required for the two missing Sundays. Hence we can safely regard the "Dominica post natale apostolorum" as our eighth Sunday after Trinity, with which its pericopes are found to agree.

up all that has gone before, and opening the subsequent pericopes, which are selected as unfolding its perfecting course, its fruitfulness in Christian life, surpassing Judaism, rising above the letter in the Spirit, meeting and conquering all antagonism, holding in a communion whose ties are unbroken by death, removing sins, and reaching out with ever renewed energy towards consummation in life everlasting, the harvest glory which Pentecost has made possible for our humanity.

The new creation in Christ manifests itself not in destroying the law, not in releasing men from obligation in the presence of its divine authority, but in *fulfilling* the law, and in such form as can alone actualize the idea of the absolute good. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy but to fulfill." To the Scribes and Pharisees the law showed itself in the form of outward restraint. True, the restraint here was self-imposed by the will, but without any real life-reconciliation between the will imposing and the will acting under the obligation. These two stood apart. They were not felt to flow together. The sense of restraint was not overcome. This legalism, necessary in the preparatory stage of revelation, was not designed to be regarded as complete in itself, but it looked to something higher which should carry the obligation into the sphere of freedom, without, however, taking away one iota of its authority. The Scribes and Pharisees failed to perceive the relative and preparatory character of their obedience in the form of legalism. They magnified the letter of the law, until the promise, to which it was added, became in reality subordinate. Thus perverted, the law was shutting out the element of love, the very element, indeed, in and by which alone the law, forever obligatory, could come to its perfect fulfillment—the very element in and by which faith was to work and purify the heart. Christ gives not a new law, as though setting aside the old, but brings into view that mystery of love in which the law and the will are one in life. Restraint vanishes, but the authority remains. The imperative command, broad and still absolute, is met by the rejoicing *I will*, which recognizes in it the very content of its



own life and freedom. There is here a marriage of love. The twain are one flesh. This gives a righteousness comprehending, while at the same time it transcends, all that is before and below it in the form of legalism—the crown and completion of the whole growth of moral life, in which the law moves beyond the letter and outward act into the depths of spiritual being, and becomes an ever abiding and inspiring motive in the will, interfusing its whole activity as the divine and self-ordained plasticity there evolving the absolute good of the moral world.

Such height of ethical perfection, as brought to view in Christ, and breathing through the beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount with a tenderness and depth of love, more awe-inspiring than the terrors and fires of Mount Sinai, is impossible to our finite and fallen life. It hovers before us an unrealized idea, towards which our moral nature turns, and with which its profoundest depths are stirred; but unto which it cannot erect itself. *We cannot unself ourselves. We cannot lose our life to gain it therein. We move about in worlds not realized. But Christ comes, the way, the truth, and the life, to incorporate us through the Spirit with Himself, (συνφύσειν, which gives us the σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν in the Epistle Selection, our becoming congenite with Him)—to surround us with the powers of the world to come, new supernatural material to enter into the mould of our character, to be made ethical by our re-energized wills, giving a morality which is religion, and a religion which is absolute. He challenges us not by surrounding the law with additional terrors, nor yet by bringing it to sharper articulation in the form of more rigorous commands, but by confronting us with the reality of a new creation, by breathing from Himself the Spirit through whom a new birth from on high may be wrought, in the presence and power of which the whole ethical glory of Christianity is made possible. This is beautifully uttered in the words of the Collect for this Sunday—words which contain in themselves a whole body of divinity—“Almighty and everlasting God, through whose mercy we are saved by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost: let this grace reign in us, we beseech thee, as the power of a new heavenly life; whereby, &c.”*

Now the Epistle (Rom. vi. 3—11) is selected as the necessary complement of what meets us in the Gospel. It answers the questions *how* and *wherein* the righteousness which exceeds that of Scribes and Pharisees, is possible, and shows at the same time its necessity, as the unfolding of a new life of grace. By the washing of regeneration and the renewal of the Holy Ghost, the foundation of grace is given. Christ becomes in us the beginning of a new creation, the source and substance of a new heavenly life. The union here is of such intimate and real character that we have become *σύνεργοι*, bound up with him in such life communion, that the great redemptive facts of His mission in the world are mysteriously reproduced in us. Our whole man, pneumatic, psychic, and somatic, is poised on Christ as the true centre, the only ground in which the possibility of its completion is reached. In this rests the reality of a righteousness exceeding that of Scribes and Pharisees. Here the law added to the promise comes to be glorified in the promise. Legalism is forever transcended; and love becomes the fulfillment of the law. Ye are come not to the mount of terror, that burned with fire, but unto Mount Zion, the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem.

The seventh Sunday after Trinity, in its gospel selection (St. Mark viii. 1—9), reminds us at once of the *letare* Sunday in Lent. According to Strauss it had a kindred title in the Middle Ages, viz., *Dominica Refectionis*. The gospel connects itself immediately with that of the preceding Sunday. The righteousness there brought to light could have no source for itself in nature, or in the law separated from the promise. The resources of our moral life are entirely inadequate; and every effort resting thereon must come to exhaustion and failure. The glorious fruits of the law of love cannot grow or cluster on the sterile stock of the old Adam; and from Mount Sinai there comes no invigorating breath of renewal. If there is to be a whitening harvest of Christian virtues, it must come through an inspiration from above, which turns the wilderness into a garden,—a vineyard of the Lord. Our wants have no ground of self-satisfaction, and no resource from which to

gather, in the world's wilderness. They can be met only, if met at all, by the compassionate love of God. In Christ, however, this love has shown itself an exhaustless fountain of satisfaction. Human hunger and thirst are met by the multiplying and beatifying fullness of the heavenly response. When Christ unfolded the fundamental principles of His Kingdom over against the false moral position of the Scribes and Pharisees, bringing into view a righteousness far transcending their legalism in all its forms, He said to the multitude crowding upon Him from Galilee, and from Decapolis, and from Jerusalem, and from Judea, and from beyond Jordan, "Blessed are the poor in spirit; blessed are they that mourn; blessed are the meek; blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness;" a pathway of suffering made beatific by the presence of His satisfying and victorious life. Now the miracle on the heathen coast of Decapolis, through which the hungry multitude were fed with perishable meat, is but a symbol of that higher spiritual refection of grace, which shall satisfy the otherwise famishing soul, and to which in the marvellous beatitudes on the mount, He directed the faith of those who heard Him.

The contrast between the righteousness of the law grossly perverted by the Scribes and Pharisees, and the righteousness of those who are children of God in the new covenant, where the law comes to its proper fulfillment in love, is now, in the Epistle selection (Romans vi. 19-23), brought into broader view. Not only in germ, but throughout their entire growth even to the end of full fructification, the two are distinct and divergent; speaking after the manner of men, they are two quite contrary services, the one a service of sin, the other of righteousness. The wages of the one is death; the other meets with the overwhelming reward of grace, everlasting life. The process of the one is under the irresistible dominion of death; the growth of the other blossoms into fruits of holiness unto paradise. The end here is not the result of any nature-growth; it is a gift of grace involved in that *supernaturale donum*, without which humanity, at its best estate, cannot hold itself within

the divine kingdom. It is no more than proper to remark that the collect in our 'Order of Worship' has beautifully emphasized the refreshing, comforting, satisfying side of this Dominica Refectionis. "Shed abroad Thy love in our hearts, we beseech Thee, and cause the comfort of Thy heavenly grace to abound in us, as the earnest and pledge of joys to come; that casting away all anxious thoughts for the transitory things of this world, we may seek first Thy kingdom and righteousness, and labor only for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life."

The unfolding fruitfulness of the new life in the Spirit serves at once as an evidence of its reality and power. Just as the hidden life in the plant controls by its plastic energy the whole growth, and characterizes the fruit, thorns bearing thorns, and figs bearing figs, so that the thorns and figs may be regarded as embodiments of the inward vitalizing energy that filleth all in all; so here, the fruits of grace inhere in the life of grace so as to constitute the form of its manifestation, the *forma formata* of that hidden inward activity of the new creation which is the *forma informans* of the whole process. Faith works by love, and the works here constitute the sphere in which the life of faith utters itself, and in which the blessing involved therein comes to realization. St. James, in speaking of the perfect law of liberty, abiding in which the Christian shows himself a doer of the work, and is blessed in his doing (*ἐν τῇ ποιήσει αὐτοῦ*), mentions what he regards as the vestments and ceremonial of this new reality of grace,—its *θησαυρία* as over against the ceremonial legalism of the Scribes and Pharisees,\* viz: "to visit

\* Coleridge has well apprehended the sublime manner in which St. James brings into view the new and absolute character of Christianity, as transcending in kind all Jewish legalism and all mere world morality. In an aphorism, having St. James i. 27 in view, he writes, "The outward service [*θησαυρία*] of ancient religion, the rites, ceremonies, and ceremonial vestments of the old law, had morality for their substance. They were the letter, of which morality was the Spirit; the enigma, of which morality was the meaning. But morality itself is the service and ceremonial [*cultus exterior*, *θησαυρία*] of the Christian religion. The scheme of grace and truth that became [began to exist and was made to exist—*ἐγένετο*] through Jesus Christ, the faith that looks down into the perfect law of liberty, has light for its garment; its very robe is righteousness."

the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." It is quite evident that in the mind of St. James Christianity is something quite different from an improved system of ethics, in which, resting still upon the *naturally moral* (the moral irrespective of the supernatural), there is only a clearer enunciation of the law, and more potent motives are forced upon the will from abroad. He clearly acknowledges the mystery here of a new creation. Christians are begotten with the word of truth to be a kind of first-fruits of the creation. It is on the base of this transition into a higher sphere, that the whole ethical movement is made to rest. This makes way for the true assertion of powers from the heavenly world, and these now constitute the inward fructifying energy, which makes possible the growth and the fruit; and hence the fruits here serve as the outward embodiment in which the inward mystery realizes itself. "By their fruits ye shall know them." It is this thought which the gospel selection for the eighth Sunday after Trinity (St. Matt. vii. 15-21) takes up, bringing into view at the same time also the necessary judgment which falls upon the corrupt fruit bearing tree. *It shall be hewn down and cast into the fire.* This side of judgment reaches still greater emphasis in the gospel for the tenth Sunday after Trinity, but of course does not come to its full articulation until the gospel and epistle closing the Church Year. It should be remarked here, also, that the Kingdom of heaven is still presented in form of a promise—something not yet present in its full reality, but something toward which the whole Christian life is poised. The form of promise here is quite distinct from that which meets us in the old economy, as we shall soon see; it is of such character, however, as to make the example of the Jews in relation to their promise of most solemn practical account.

The epistle selection, (Romans viii. 12—17), stands in most intimate relation with the whole theme of thought introduced by the Gospel for the sixth Sunday after Trinity. It may be regarded as one of the most profound exhibitions of the mystery of Christian life given us in the Scriptures, beginning with a

supernatural sonship through the Spirit in which the Christian is brought into such living union with Christ, as to be a joint heir with Him, having fellowship with His sufferings, and at last glorified together with Him. There is a life after the flesh. Indeed all human life is after the flesh, as descending from the fallen Adam, unless translated into another sonship, by the Spirit. There must be a lifting out of the sphere of nature by the Spirit, before there can be any true spiritual mastery of the world or self in the will. Being dead unto sin, and alive unto God, are but two sides of one and the same reality of grace, wherein the death and resurrection of Christ become redemptive mysteries into the bosom of which we are planted by the Spirit. This does not imply what may be called personal passivity on the part of man. The mystery here is just this, that the person itself is interpenetrated. The lifting out of the sphere of nature is at the same time a bringing of our life back to its own deepest ground in God, so that it now finds itself, and recognizes its own idea and law, and thus becomes free. The transition here is not magical, although sacramental. If it were it would be but another form of bondage only. We receive not the spirit of bondage to fear, nor yet the spirit of bondage to obey. We are not debtors, but sons; and in this divine-wrought mystery a new inspiration embosoms the will. The Spirit beareth witness *with our spirit*. A pervading motive power homogeneous with the law of our own life, is now in the will, releasing it from its bondage, but not from its determining energy. The way is opened for fruitfulness, for good works. The predisposition of virtue is now a reality, and knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness and charity abound.

Strauss has correctly called this Sunday the *Sunday of Good Works*, and has beautifully brought out the analogies with which the coincident time of the physical year abounds. "Welche Arbeit und Thätigkeit in der Natur und an der Natur zur Zeit der reifenden Aernte! In ihr ein Gähren und Kochen der Säfte, um die Frucht zu reifen! An ihr die Eile und Mühe der Aernter, um vom frühen Morgen bis zum späten Abend

im Schweisse des Angesichts den vorhandenen Ertrag in Sicherheit zu bringen! Ueberall Geschäftigkeit und Anstrengung, wie sonst im ganzen Jahre nicht wieder! Es ist die fröhlichste Zeit der Arbeit. Auf den Feldern ertönt der Ruf der Aernter, und Mensch und Natur scheinen im Wettkampf der Thätigkeit. Das Haus steht leer und seine Bewohner sind wie Gesandte ausgegangen auf Wiesen und Fluren, um den Gewinn heimzubringen. Als wenn der Geist der Sonne sie triebe, die reichen Kinder des Lichts zu sammeln, die faulen Früchte von den guten zu sondern, und dem gesunden Baume, dem fruchtbaren Felde, der üppigen Wiese ihre Ehre zu geben; so vereinen sich beide, Mensch und Natur, in ihrem gesegneten Werk." (Das Evang. Kirchenjahr, S. 315).

The Christian life finds itself unfolding in the midst of the world. It cannot isolate itself from the social relations which belong to history. While these relations form a general sphere for the free exercise of love, communicating love, they are to react also upon the individual. There is a reciprocal action here, a giving and a receiving. In the mould of character, this action ceases to be temporary and earthly merely, and becomes spiritual, part of the life itself. Christian life demands, therefore, a wise prudence, which shall subordinate this reciprocal action to the true end towards which its own supernatural vocation calls. The world may be used against itself, and the temporal adversities and perplexities with which it surrounds the Christian may be, by the strength of love which gazes steadily heavenward, turned to eternal advantage. It is this which forms the general theme of the Gospel selection for the ninth Sunday after Trinity, (St. Luke xvi. 1—9).

The parable here given is one of very difficult interpretation. This profound truth, however, which connects itself with what precedes and follows after in the selections of the Church for this season, is brought into quite clear emphasis, viz.: that the Christian life conditions itself in reference to things eternal, the promise or glory held out before it; and that the love which yearns towards heaven should have strength in it to subordinate and surmount all adversities and perplexi-



ties which surround it, that it may be recipient of the promise in the day of divine visitation and recompense,—cast out by the world, and casting out the world, to be received into the glory everlasting.

There is a warning also involved in this parable. It is couched in the words, the children of the world are more prudent in acting toward their own generation (*εις την γενεαν*) than the children of light (toward theirs). The former are bent wholly to the worldly. They live in it and for it, pursue its maxims, husband its resources, and inherit its rewards; the latter are in danger of a divided service, not being able, if walking by sight, to see the way of escape from the power of temptation which besets them from the world, which, although renounced, still asserts its claims. The epistle selection, (1 Cor. x. 1—13), brings this into view, continuing the thoughts which met us in the Gospel for the preceding Sunday. In this selection from Corinthians, the chosen people of God, *all* of whom were baptized in the cloud and in the sea, and did eat the same spiritual meat and did drink the same spiritual drink, are used as examples for us upon whom the ends of the world are come; for *many* of them, overpowered by the temporal and worldly, fell in the wilderness, and were destroyed of the destroyer, because failing to grasp in faith those gracious powers which were within their reach, and really at hand in the bosom of that Covenant which apprehended them. A like possibility of falling in the new Covenant is that which gives such solemn force to the exhortation, "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." In the preceding epistle selection the same thought met us in a different form: "*If ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live.*"

Though the sons of God, though born of the Spirit, though buried with Christ by baptism unto death, and lifted above the order of nature into a kingdom of supernatural powers, yet, as we have remarked, this is not magical in the way of setting aside the proper ethical character of our life. We must not, in emphasizing Grace and the opposing bondage of sin, find ourselves only in another form of bondage. The divine does

not cast out the human, and make men mere passive and non-moral instruments to further its own gracious ends. The powers of the heavenly world are at hand, and we are so planted in them by the new birth, that the glory which is set before us is within our reach as never before. The burial in baptism as the beginning has for its proper end the final glorification, and sets us into the bosom of powers which make possible such issue; but the beginning must reach out to the end in a real ethical process. The birth-right must be maintained. Faith must hold firmly the mystery unto the end, lest it be lost irrecoverably. "Ye cannot bear fruit except ye abide in me."

In the natural order, character is not a fixed and given thing at the start, as though allotted by some decree back of and independent of the physical and historical relations of life. We are born into the midst of a thousand varying forces, physical and historical, which are to be made ethical by the will, (they are not so at first,) appetites, temperaments, family life, national life, &c., &c.,—broad forces, which must be elevated into the ethical sphere in character by the self-determining energies of the will. Without this, what have we beyond mere physical organization, and impulses, and peculiar in-wrought instincts, for moral character, and no real selfhood whatever,—the highest result it may be of Nature's process of individuation and nothing more,—the personal unreached after all, and man falling back into the lap of nature, and the good forever unrealized? By natural birth we come into the bosom of these outlying and inworking forces, and with the capacity to make them so many utterances of ethical significance. This is the problem before each and every one; and upon its solution depends the character, whatever it may be; and for this each and every one feels his responsibility. Although we stand in the first Adam, and through the fall are under the power of original sin, yet the moral element of our human life is not eradicated even by this; and we see how room is given for endless forms and gradations of depravity, and for what may be termed worldly virtues also, although these can never rise above the

bondage of self into the freedom and glory of the new creation in Christ.

Now in an important sense what is thus true of natural birth is true of the birth supernatural. By this we are brought into the bosom of supernatural powers, more real even than the power and forces of Nature itself. These powers have their ground and source in Christ, in whom the whole movement of divine revelation centres from beginning to end. Forth from Him, through the Spirit, they enter into the movement of history, and constitute a kingdom of grace in the world. Into this kingdom we are engrafted, so that the powers of the new creation are at hand for us and within our reach as never before. They apprehend us in baptism in a manner quite distinct from any other form of apprehension, and set us by such apprehension in the right and necessary posture to make proper account of them in faith. We must apprehend them, and in this responsive apprehension, faith, at first obedient and receptive, moves into activity, and in and through this activity these powers of the world to come actualize themselves in us in the form of Christian character. Without this real movement, what the new birth gives at the beginning can never reach over to its possible and proper issue in the end, viz. : life everlasting. The beginning makes the end possible, potentially includes it, we may say, but must move forward to it by a real ethical process,—a process of course not possible outside of the new creation itself. The after-process does not set aside the beginning, but is the rich unfolding of what is there at hand for such end. What else does St. Peter mean, when, having mentioned the mystery of our partaking of the divine nature through grace, he adds, “And besides this, giving all diligence, *add to your faith, virtue; and to virtue, knowledge; and to knowledge, temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience, godliness; and to godliness, brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness, charity? For if these things be in you and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren or unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. For he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and*

*hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins. Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure; for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall."* How real the process here, and how environed with perils; and hence how solemn the warnings are! The epistle selection for this ninth Sunday after Trinity, brings this into prominence as emphasizing the necessity of that wise prudence which the gospel selection enforces, or that making such due account of eternal interests as to subordinate the whole compass of earthly relations to them—a wisdom really not of this world, although prefigured in much that meets us in worldly activities.

We have been more lengthy in our remarks upon these pericopes, where the epistle selections are predominantly from St. Paul, to show if possible that they were not selected, as has been charged, in the interest of a theology which sacrificed faith to good works,\* but in the interest of a faith which followed the order of the Creed, and hence transcended alike the extreme of Calvinism and that of Arminianism. This will become more apparent we trust, as we further examine the selections in their natural relations.

The selection of the gospel for the tenth Sunday after Trinity (St. Luke xix. 41-47), which brings into view the judgment upon Jerusalem, some suppose to have been determined by the fact that this Sunday comes at the time of the year in which

---

\* This charge has been made by Luther, where he allows his zealous opposition to what he felt to be the prevailing Pelagian legalism of the Roman Catholic Church, to lead him to attribute to the lectionaria of the ancient Church a motive of selection not fairly deducible from a candid examination of the lectionaria themselves. It is true he was willing to retain the selections as he found them, with the understanding, however, that the Sermon might serve as an antidote to the lurking poison. We quote this statement in full from the "Formula Missæ et Communions," framed for the Wittenberg Church in the year 1523, given in Hospinian's *Hist. Sacrament, pars altera*, p. 27:

"Post hanc, (the Collect). lectio Epistolæ. Verum nondum tempus est et hic novandi, quando nulla impia legitur. Alioqui cum raro eas partes ex Epistolis Pauli legantur, in quibus fides docetur, sed potissimum morales et exhortatorie. Ut ordinator ille Epistolarum videatur fuisse insigniter indoctus et superstitiosus operum ponderatur, officium requirebat eas potius pro majore parte ordinare, quibus fides in Christum docetur. Idem certe in Evangeliiis spectavit æpius, quisquis fuit lectionum istarum author. Sed interim supplebit hoc vernacula Concio."

Jerusalem was destroyed by the Romans—Aug. 9-10—(See Gavanti Comm. in Rubr. Missalis Pars iv. Tit. xii. 16). Such motive of selection, however, is very questionable, especially when the lesson is so clearly in harmony of connection; for the suffering love of Christ in behalf of Jerusalem over which, in the day of its gracious visitation, impended the awful judgment called down upon it at last from Heaven by its own rejection of Jesus, falls in with the tone of thought which the preceding Sunday's lesson has suggested, and partly developed.

The righteousness of scribes and pharisees, which had falsely elevated the law until the promise was quite overshadowed, or made to have a false legal and worldly coloring in politico-moral Messianic hopes, reached of course its height of falsehood when confronted by the mystery to which the promise directed. Now it was challenged by just this mystery, and could not but unmask its hidden depth of perversion. It arrayed itself against the meek and holy One, and, rejecting Him, doomed Him to the Cross, throwing itself over wholly into the arms of the world, when wildly clamoring to the Roman authority, "Crucify Him! Crucify Him!" Blinded by setting aside the true intent of the old Covenant, forgetting the consummation towards which its whole revelation looked, and for which it was designed to open the way in awakening and purifying all the religious susceptibilities of the chosen people to welcome it, this pharisaical spirit had no eyes to see the glory of Him who came to redeem it, and who wept in tears of sorrowing woe over the heartless infidelity of His own people, as He saw the awful condemnation which it was calling down upon them. The tree bearing such fruit, like the falsely-promising fig tree, could but be cursed, and wither. It must be hewn down and cast into the fire. The apostacy in the wilderness was but the first foreshadowing of this awful result; and this awful result itself is but a faint foreshadowing of the final judgment in Christ's Second Advent.

The epistle selection (1 Cor. xii. 1-11) contains the main theme, the fruitful development of the life in the Spirit, in its positive aspects. The diversity of spiritual gifts shows at once the freedom of Christian life, and the necessity of making the gifts

of the new creation inward, ethical powers of our life. These gifts all have their ground in the Spirit. They are indeed manifestations of one and the self-same Spiritual presence; but this manifestation is given to every man to profit withal. The descent of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, glorifying Christ in the disciples, gives us the necessary and lasting foundation for His universal operation in the Church. This universal operation, however, is not arbitrary, as though only mechanically related to those in whom it is present. The Spirit enters into the individual capacities and divides the charismata in most intimate relation to the differing personalities. In other words, the manifestation of the Spirit is *characterized* in the movement of religious life. The gifts here, however, are not isolated and individual, as though the possession of this and that one irrespective of the order of grace in which they come to pass. They flow from one and the self-same Spirit working all in all, and are constituent elements of the mysterious organism of the Church. This the Apostle Paul profoundly declares in the immediate context. "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free: and have been all made to drink into one Spirit. For the body is not one member, but many." The Communion of Saints is a living communion. The birth of the Spirit opens the way for a manifoldness of His manifestations in the rich fruitfulness of Christian life, and brings us into a kingdom whose unity of organism transcends all nature beside. It is well to remark here how the unity of the Church is not made to rest upon a single episcopal see, or upon one who has a special spiritual gift in the form of personal official infallibility; but shows itself a mystery quite back of all this. We shall have occasion to dwell upon this, however, when it comes to fuller emphasis as it does in the selections for the sixteenth and seventeenth Sundays after Trinity.

The righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, resting on the letter of the law, and destitute of the element of love,—and never rising above a sense of forced restraint, degenerated into the lowest forms of legalism, in which, confining the whole scope of the law to externals, self-righteousness and pride as-

sumed the place of penitence and love and humility, and blighted all susceptibilities for anything beyond. This forms one side of the gospel selection for the eleventh Sunday after Trinity (St. Luke xviii. 9-14). Over against this false righteousness, which exalting itself is abased, the lesson places that sinfulness which knows itself, and which therefore is felt to make all merely external obedience vain until it is itself eradicated from the Spirit,—an abasement which ends in exaltation, because it marks a susceptibility to rise to the grasp of the law in its true spiritual sublimity, as demanding for its obedience first of all a new creation in grace from above, in the bosom of which the hitherto burdened will may come into loving harmony with the absolute command.

The epistle selection (1 Cor. xv. 1-11) passes over to one who reached this true exaltation :—one who referred all to the mystery of the redemption wrought out in Christ, and is humbled at the very thought of being an Apostle. Although transcending the Pharisee in fastings and tithes, giving up all that he had, and laboring more abundantly than all the Apostles, he declares with sublime humility, “By the grace of God I am what I am.” What a contrast here with the Pharisee of the gospel selection ! What a glorious response in way of exaltation to the humility of penitence which cries, have mercy on us poor miserable sinners !

The righteousness of the kingdom of grace, in contrast with the false, and self-sufficient, Pharisaical legalism, still continues to be the main theme in the lessons for the twelfth and thirteenth Sundays after Trinity, in the latter expanding into a broad survey of the true relation of the two covenants. At first glance the gospel selection, (St. Mark vii. 31-37), seems to have but little reference to what has gone before, and to be out of all connection with its corresponding epistle (2 Cor. iii. 4-11). It is this no doubt which led Thamer to place this gospel selection among the lessons which he regarded as selected with direct reference to Arianism ; as though the ancient Church had designed to combat that prevailing heresy by bringing into as great prominence as possible the miraculous work of Jesus. This criticism is of little worth ; for it fails here as elsewhere to catch



the motive of selection which a careful study will bring to light. The miracle must be studied in its immediate connections as given in St. Mark, and not in isolation. It will then reveal with great clearness its proper inter-relations with the lessons surrounding it.

The seventh chapter of St. Mark opens with an earnest conflict between Christ and the Scribes and Pharisees. These latter, in their self-sufficient bondage to the law, complained to Christ of the freedom of His disciples, who, they charged, were breaking loose from the traditions of the elders. Christ meets them with the counter charge "Full well ye reject the commandments of God, that ye may keep your own tradition." Theirs was but lip-homage to God, while the heart was far off. The Saviour then calls to Him the people and teaches them by a parable, which at once unmasks the false position of the Pharisaic legalism. "There is nothing from without a man, that entering into him, can defile him; but the things which come out of him, these are they that defile a man." What avails outward conformity to the law, cold, calculating restraint, or even the mere force of conscience in the sphere of casuistry, if the law has no living lodgment within as one with the very idea of the life,—an empowering and inspiring principle in the will? After this public response to the assault of the Pharisees, the Saviour withdraws to the borders of Tyre and Sidon. Lange has so beautifully brought out the circumstances of the miracle which constitutes the Gospel lesson, and in such perfect, although undesigned, uniformity with the order of thought which the pericopes now under consideration follow, that we cannot forbear quoting from him.

"Thus had the Lord publicly disposed of the attacks of the hierarchical party, together with their chiefs from Jerusalem. He had rebuked their hypocrisy, condemned their system of tradition. Then had He withdrawn Himself from His opposers in indignation, after He had spoken to the people a pregnant word, in which the transformation of the Old Testament laws concerning meats into their New Testament significance was enclosed. On this, He arose forthwith, and departed into the

region of Tyre and Sidon. In the first instance, His object seemed to be refreshment—refreshment from the oppressive atmosphere of that incorrigible and hypocritical spirit of tradition. For He retired into a house, and would have no man know that He was there. But He could not remain concealed. A certain woman, whose daughter had an unclean spirit, heard of Him, and she came and fell at His feet. \* \* \* \* By this restoration of the daughter of a heathen woman on heathen ground, had the Lord already shown that the assertion of His spiritual freedom, over against the ordinances of the Pharisees, had entered on a new stage. But He made this further evident by the fact, that in now taking His departure from the Phœnician territory in order to return to the Galilean Sea, He passed through the midst of the region of Decapolis (the territory of ten cities), mostly inhabited by heathens." (Lange's *Life of Christ*, vol. 6, pp. 29-30.) The New Testament passes beyond the narrow limitations of the Old, and reveals a kingdom of grace embracing the whole fallen race,—covering the whole extent of the fall with its redemptive glory. In the epistle selection, (2 Cor. iii. 4-11), the glory of the New Covenant is dwelt upon, as transcending the ministration of the law,—itself a ministration of the Spirit,—a ministration of righteousness over against a ministration of condemnation, and an enduring ministration, while the one with which it is contrasted passeth away. This opens the way for the gospel and epistle, (beautifully correlated), for the thirteenth Sunday after Trinity, (St. Luke x. 23-37; Gal. iii. 16-22) which bring into full survey the true relation of the two covenants, and close this special line of thought; although the two following Sundays continue the general theme.

In the gospel lesson the Saviour is not confronted by a hypocritical Pharisee, but by a lawyer who seems to have grasped the law in its deeper and more fundamental significance. In theory at least he was correct; and, in answering the Saviour, he expressed the very spirit of the law. The Saviour, therefore, replied to him at once, "This *do*, and thou shalt live." The lawyer, however, now brought into view the narrowing

limitations which still fettered his spirit, and the lurking pride of legalism, also, in his effort of self-justification—"Who is my neighbor?" The sublime parable, with which the Saviour answered, unfolds a sweep of love soaring beyond all limitations, —a love only possible through recreating grace, a love in which the whole law is glorified in fulfillment, in which the Old Testament passes over into the completing glory of the New. This is the magnificent preface to the epistle in which the true meaning and scope of the Old Testament law is fully brought to light. This selection demands therefore a more detailed examination.

The Old Testament was not a covenant of law, but of promise. The promises were connected with a chosen seed, forming thus, in their unfolding, a true historical movement in the world. Although reaching over ages, and assuming differing forms (*πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως*), these promises showed themselves to be under the unifying, organizing power of one and the self-same mystery, which the whole revelation held steadily in view, and which was itself the immanent, controlling idea of the whole movement. In the same manner as the promises, numerically many, rested in the mystery of one great promise, of which they were fragmentary utterances: so the chosen seed, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and the elect from age to age, numerically many, centred in *the* seed, the one all embracing elect, the son of man and Son of God, the first-born of every creature, the ideal promise and the ideal seed which found preparatory utterance in the O. T. revelation. The freedom with which St. Paul interprets the O. T. promises, laying stress upon the one seed, Christ, and forcing the collective *σπέρμα* to his aid, has been seriously objected to. Jerome says, such kind of exegesis will do for the stupid Galatians. But the ancient Fathers had generally a very mechanical view of the O. T. The collective seed, as bearing with them the promises and the whole movement of revelation, rested upon the reality that there shall be one in whom the divine and human come together in one personality, in whom the whole movement from God manward, and from man Godward, should be seen to rest in one source and

centre. In fact the movement of the promises itself indicated this, moving from Abraham to Isaac, from Isaac to Jacob, concentrated in one, and thence expanding, and then reconcentred in one again, looking forward to the absolute one, viz., Christ. St. Paul from the N. T. standpoint clearly sees this truth, and catches in his glance the spirit which was under the letter of the O. T., in the presence of which all criticism of the letter, separately viewed, seemed to be of little account. With what bold, exegetical sweep he declares of the Israelites, "they did all eat the same spiritual meat; and did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ." And again, with what subtilty of interpretation he brings out the allegory inclosed in the two sons of Abraham as referring to the two covenants. So here he seizes upon the "*to Abraham and to his seed*," recognizing at once the end involved in the progression of the promises, which rest not on Abraham but pass on to his seed, and because passing, only relative, yet involving, by the very movement and personal concentration, an end,—the absolute end, that is Christ,—*the end*,—the promise in the totality of its idea, upon which the whole movement hinged. The covenant is a covenant of promise, including in the fullness of its idea the mystery of the Incarnation, which found in such form preparatory utterance for itself. Now the law is an addition, resting upon the promise and not annulling it,—a way to walk in for the children of the covenant, that they may not transgress, and if transgressing, that they may realize their condemnation and cling to the promise as that in which salvation must forever rest. The fact of transgression here, however, is not merely hypothetical; for the race is involved in original sin, under the bondage of its law, the law of death, which can only be broken by the mystery of the promise. The walk in the law, and the condemnation following upon transgression, both alike, come to direct to Christ, the one deepening the susceptibilities for something higher, longings for the glory to come, (as in Simeon and others): the other, never allowing the sense of condemnation to slumber, deepening the need of deliverance and wringing out

from the depths of the disturbed conscience the penitential cry in the wilderness "make straight the way of the Lord."

The circumstances connected with the giving of the law to which only incidental reference is made in the epistle selection, confirms this view. The conditions were not these, viz. : Ye are outcasts, in the gall of bitterness and in the bonds of iniquity, incapable of communion with God, and hence there must be prescribed certain imperative precepts, on the ground of obeying which, God will be willing to enter upon terms of intercourse. Nothing of this kind can possibly be gathered from the Old Testament record. On the contrary the law is given as pointing out a walk worthy of the vocation which was theirs. I am the God of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, your fathers. I am the God of Israel, who delivered thee out of the bondage of Egypt. I am the God who hath loved thee, and heard thy cries, and come to thine aid, making bare my arm for thy redemption, overwhelming thy foes in the cloud and in the water which baptized thee; *therefore*, in the presence of such breadth, and length, and depth, and height of covenant love, love me, serve me, and walk as I now command, waiting for the consummation of the glorious promise hastening in upon the world when the seed shall come who shall bruise the Serpent's head. This mystery the legal Pharisee saw not. But the epistle selection shows a Pharisee, who, in the power and presence of new-creating grace, transcends the whole sphere of legalism, and yet sets not aside the glory of the law in its proper relation, as transfigured and glorified in the obedience of love, a love absolutely perfect, once for all, in Jesus Christ.

The righteousness of the kingdom of God has its foundation in the mystery of regeneration. It is not the result of obedience to the law, but the reality of a new creation in which obedience is made possible by the presence and power of grace. This righteousness shows itself as a fruit of the Spirit. We have mentioned, in connection with the first Sunday after Trinity, how broad and fundamental here is the mystery of love, in which by the indwelling of Christ, the Christian is rooted and grounded, and comes in the end to know the love of Christ

which passeth all knowledge. The law is fulfilled and glorified in love. But the activity of love continually rests on the receptivity of love. The subject and object cannot stand apart here. Love seeks its source, and finds its completion in union therewith. In this it can forever abide. What stands in the way of this, whether from within or from without, comes under the reversed power of love, the condemnation and wrath, which in the Christian, relative to the life of the Spirit, is a crucifixion of the flesh and the lusts thereof. Just so long as the power of a fallen life can assert itself, just so long love prompts to a conflict, gaining strength until at last it rises victorious in the marriage-feast of the Bride and Bridegroom. The epistle for the fourteenth Sunday after Trinity, (Gal. v. 16—24), emphasizes this truth.

As love, however, is drawn with the power of an attraction which fills it from the object, it cannot but throw itself prostrate before it as the life of its life, in the free thankfulness of its satisfaction and joy. When the leprous malady is felt to be broken, and the healing inspiration breathes through the enlivening frame, the spirit turns back from the path of legalism, falls before the Giver of life, and in its humbled thankfulness finds itself drawn higher into the glorious liberty of the sons of God. Such is the lesson of the Gospel, (St. Luke xvii. 11—19); an exhibition of the fruit of the Spirit, love, joy, peace, greater and worthier than sacrifice, which are indeed not only fruits, but so many spiritual energies awakening into quicker motion the heavenward aspirations of the soul. When our spirit meets that which is the very source and substance of its true being, or is apprehended by that which answers forever its own deepest sense and meaning, there enters into the will a broad and glorious inspiration such as the world of sense and history can never give. The divine shines in upon us as the proper life and light of all our living and seeing. As when Spring returns with its warm light and genial breath, the fetters of winter are loosened, and on every hill-side, and in every valley ten thousand hidden germs of life unfold their energies, and tissue after tissue starts into being, and the whole earth

teems with life; so in this inward revelation of the supernatural, bringing into the compass of our being the genial light and recreating warmth of grace, the fetters of sin are loosened; every power is aroused into energy, and a current of fresh, vigorous life goes coursing through every vein and artery; a thousand hidden capabilities are awakened, and clustering with the growing fruits of the Spirit, we move upward and heavenward out of the conflict of the flesh, from faith to virtue, from virtue to knowledge, from strength to strength, from beauty to beauty, and from glory to glory, until we are transformed into the image of the glorified Redeemer, as by the Spirit of the Lord.

In the Gospel and epistle selections for the fifteenth Sunday after Trinity, (St. Matt. vi. 21—24; and Gal. v. 25, v. 10), summing up in most fundamental form the new reality of grace over against all possible schemes of world-life, whether merely moral or religious, we have the broad distinction of Spirit and Flesh, God and Mammon, the supernatural and natural; and as opening the way for the transition which meets us in the next Sunday, we have the necessary issue emphasized towards which, in antagonism, each is reaching. The unselfish love of the good Samaritan, (Christ indeed, redeeming with love and making His Church a steward of His grace until He shall return and then reward her in glory), and the grateful response of the healed leper, the former as against the priest and Levite, the latter as against the nine ingrates who rested in the merely selfish satisfaction of outward benefits reaching no further than the flesh,—these manifestations of the Spirit are now seen to rest upon the reality of that kingdom of Grace, that new creation, in the bosom of which the whole sympathy of our being, the whole law of our life is made to centre, assured that in full self-surrender to it we are in that household of God, that communion and order of life, whose issue is life everlasting by the very warrant of its relation to the providence or aim of God in reference to the whole creation. Towards this glorious issue, therefore, with unfainting and unwearied love we must turn, breaking through all earth-surrounding anxieties and



cares knowing that within the communion there are resources for every want and conflict: because, (as the lesson of next Sunday teaches with fulness of emphasis, the transition having been accomplished), we reach therein a family, transcending death and unbroken by that which severs all earthly ties, a family in Him who is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. The end here inwardly rules and controls our whole life. There are only two masters, because there are only two possible ends of our human existence; the one, where the end is made to be self and the world, or the order of life and history in which we stand as bound to the first and fallen Adam: the other where the end is made to be the glory of that order of grace objectively present in the new creation in Christ, Mammon and God, the Spirit and the Flesh, the natural and the supernatural. These two are all the while challenging the service of our life, and show themselves as inwardly controlling our whole activity. They are in direct contrast, and in irreconcilable antagonism. In no sense can the service of the one be joined with the service of the other. They reach out to infinitely divergent ends, and show us at last the hell and heaven which have ever hovered, more or less distinctly, before the moral sense of mankind.

## ART. X.—THE BOOK OF JONAH.

BY REV. J. B. KIRSCHNER, MERCERSBURG, PA.

THE Book of Jonah, the fifth of the Minor Prophets, is one of the most interesting fragments of Ancient Literature. Besides the importance which attaches to all the books of the Old Testament Canon, as documents of the religion of the old covenant and sources for the most interesting chapter in the early spiritual history of our race, the book now under consideration claims our attention and incites our investigation by traits peculiarly its own. Unlike the rest of the Books of this series, it is not the work of the prophet whose name it bears: it does not profess to be such. He is invariably referred to in the third person, the prayer, &c., excepted; the mode of commencement indicates that it may have been a portion of a larger collection of historical or biographical memoirs. Moreover the remark that Nineveh *was* a great city, c. iii. 3, seems plainly to refer its origin to a date at which Nineveh with all its greatness was a thing of the past. Again, the book contains no prophecy: the contents of the prophetic mission, in the other books the chief contents, is here reduced to a few verses. The *person* of the prophet is the centre of the narrative, which is a section of his life. In the Book of Jeremiah, for instance, the historical notices are introduced as the frame-work of the prophecies; here the *history* is the main consideration; the prophecy retires into the back-ground, and the worth of the book for subsequent ages lies in the *typical* character of its contents. But the historical incidents are most peculiar. A charge committed to a prophet of the chosen people, whose activity, efficiency, whose very existence, as a prophet, was conditioned by the presence of the Laws and the Theocracy; who was powerless to convert the heart, to break the power of

Idolatry, to stem the torrent of ethnic corruption except when he stood upon the firm foundation of the Law, not only moral, but ceremonial,—of the Law in its historical totality—all of which is plain from Deut. c. xviii. and from the fate of the whole prophetic calling, *das prophetenthum*,—in the Kingdom of the Ten Tribes, where the stupendous conflict of the prophets under the leadership of heroes like Elijah and Elisha, with the various untheocratic elements ended in the overthrow of prophecy *because it was unsupported by the institutions of the Law*, was without priest and levite, and a great centre of worship, in fact was torn loose from its own life source—a charge thus given to the prophet, in the utter absence of all the conditions necessary to make his mission a success, must strike all who reflect upon it with great surprise. The mission of Elisha to the neighboring kingdom of Damascus to anoint Hazael king of Syria is absolutely no parallel: Elisha was acting under the commission of his great predecessor Elijah (1 Kings xix. 15, 2 Kings viii. 7), whose fame, as well as his own filled all the lands from the Orontes to Egypt: he was executing a political, not a moral mission; and he was doing so in the interest of the theocracy in which he stood and whose organ he was. But Jonah unknown—unless through the report of his wonderful preservation in the belly of the fish, a report, which, resting merely upon his own word\* could seem only ridiculous to a city of inlanders—was sent to preach repentance to Nineveh, a city which had not as yet dawned up on the horizon of the political world of that age, and to convert it to the worship of a Deity of whom it had never heard.

The instrument chosen for this unusual purpose was the most unworthy possible. No prophet of the Old Testament, not even the name and reputation of Balaam appears in so dubious a light as this seer. Having received the command of Jehovah,

---

\* It has been said that the ground of the Ninevites' belief and repentance lay in the fact of the Prophet's miraculous rescue. But in this instance, that involves not only the fact that God overruled the sin of His servant for the greater success of his mission, but also the positing of unfaithfulness, as the condition of his success. If Jonah had not done *wrong* he could not have done as required.

the Lord of the whole earth, he sought in his unwillingness and terror\* to flee to some place where the voice and the arm of the God of Israel could not reach him.† But Jehovah is all-powerful, also upon the sea. He raised a storm from which the crew of the ship escaped only by the sacrifice of Jonah whose guilt was determined by lot, and confessed by himself. But Jonah was not to perish, for his work was not yet done. A great fish swallowed the outcast, and in its belly he is preserved alive and conscious for three days and three nights; and then he was thrown out upon the land, (*Josephus* says, upon a coast of the *Euxine*). Again he is sent to Nineveh to announce the destruction of that vast and wicked city, unless it repent. Now the prophet enters upon the work of his mission probably with a full belief in its failure. But when he was successful beyond all expectation, when he saw the city repentant, sitting in sackcloth and ashes, and even the beasts fasting in the emblems of mourning, thus averting a dreadful destruc-

---

\* But why did the Prophet flee? Selt propheta, sancto sibi spiritu suggerente, quod pœnitentia gentium ruina sit Judeorum. Idcirco amator patriæ sum non tam salutis invidet Ninive quam non vult perire populum suum. Præterea videns comprophetas suos mitti ad oves perditas omnis Israel ut ad pœnitentiam populum provocarent . . . . Se solum electum qui mitteretur ad Assyrios inimicos Israel et ad civitatem hostium maximam, ubi idololatria, ubi ignoratio Dei: et quod his majus est timebat ne per occasionem prædictionis sum, illis conversis ad pœnitentiam, Israel penitus relinqueretur, etc., So Jerome. *Commen. in C. I.*

† Jonah went down to Joppa, the only sea-port belonging to the ten tribes, with the intention of going יָבֵן. What place is meant is uncertain. One of the oldest traditions, *Josephus* Ant. 9, 10, 2, understands Tarsus in Cilicia, the birth-place of St. Paul. Tarshish in some passages is in north Africa, but generally *Tartessus* in southwest Spain: *thither* we think Jonah was fleeing. It was one of the oldest Phœnician Colonies. St. Jerome, *Comm. in Dan. c. x. 6*, takes the word in a general meaning of *Sea*, thinking that Jonah had not fixed upon any place of refuge, had only resolved to escape by *Sea*. The name is of uncertain origin.

Rawlinson derives it from a Hamitic root and interprets, *younger brother*. It seems however to be an Arian word in which case it might mean *coast-land*, Sans, *tarishn*, *sea*.

It is difficult to form any clear conception of what the Prophet meant by fleeing from the face of the Lord. Was he under the false impression, characteristic of heathenism, that the power of a deity was limited to the territory of his worshippers? Theodoretus' opinion (*Comm. in loco*) amounts to that. Evidently Jonah regarded his flight as a means of evading his commission.

tion, he was displeased exceedingly and was very angry.\* Finally when a plant† which had shaded his booth withered away and left him exposed to the wind and sultriness of the Assyrian lowlands, he was vexed unto death—"It is better for me to die than to live."

It has generally been taken for granted that Jonah, the hero of this book, is the same person with that Jonah, the son of Amittai of whom we are informed that he foretold those glorious victories by which the ancient Solomonian possessions were recovered "from the entering of Hamath unto the Sea of Arabah" (Dead Sea) and from this opinion there is no cause of dissent. From the notices given (2 Kings xiv. 25) we learn that he was of *Gath-hepher*, a town of the tribe of Zebulun, near its southeastern limits, about three miles north-northeast of Nazareth. Thus he was a prophet of the Ten Tribes; his father's name was Amittai. From the passage referred to, we learn the important fact that Jonah lived during the reign of Jeroboam II, King of Israel, and indeed during the very first part, if not during the boyhood of this monarch. This King, the greatest that ever sat upon the throne of the Ten Tribes, reigned B. C. 825—784, or to 772 as Ewald (Ges. d. V. Israel iii. 554) argues not without reason. The prophetic activity of Jonah, so far as it is handed down to us in the Book of 2 Kings certainly falls in, or before, the first part of Jeroboam II's reign; for it is evident that the victories which he foretold belong to that period, thus circa B. C. 825. It may not be without interest to remark here that, according to a very ancient tradition, it was Jonah, whom Elisha sent to anoint Jehu as de-

---

\* Jerome's explanation—*Indignabatur quondam et Jonas, cur Deo fuerit jubente mentitus . . . malens cum perniciem innumerabilis populi verumdicere quam tantorum salute mentiri*, Adv. Pelag., III, 6, rests on the basis at the old idea, that all the deeds of the Holy Men of all, must at all costs be acquitted of the charge of sin; an idea which long kept the teachers of the Church from a complete and correct apprehension of the characters of many spiritual heroes; e. g. of the Patriarchs and of David; and which Calvin was among the first to rectify. Jonah ignored too the divine *hypothesis* underlying every prophecy of this kind.

† Not a *gourd*, but the *Palma Christi Ricinus communis*, now common in our gardens.

stroyer of the idolatrous house of Ahab, and as the future possessor of his throne. 2 Kings ix. 1-10. This tradition is found in the Midrash (Jalkut Melachim, 13 cer.) whence through Jewish commentators it has passed into the Western world. Of course this can *scarcely* be true, for it is not likely that a prophet who was a *young man* B. C. 893 could still be in official activity almost 60 years afterward; still it is not directly impossible, as we may see from the case of Isaiah, if the tradition be founded on fact that he was sawn asunder during the reign of Manasseh. Comp. Heb. xi. 37.

Such is an outline of the incident recorded in the Book of Jonah of its hero, and of the life and activity of a prophet belonging to the cycle of theocratic worthies headed by Elijah and Elisha. For reasons which have been variously stated, and which have become the object of much discussion in modern times, the book soon passed into the list of the canonical writings of the Jews. It kept its place for ages, under the protecting shadow of the name of Jonah. And when the Messiah came, he found it capable of furnishing him with striking analogies in his relation to the surrounding theocratic world, and with a type of his fate, as far as his earthly life was concerned. The fathers of the Church always regarded the contents of this book as history, but allegorized its facts and its names. "As Jonah went down into the sea, so the Saviour came down among the roaring billows of the peoples of the world (Jerome)." But it could not meet with such a reception among the spiritual kinsmen of Porphyry and of Celsus. Traces of their mode of treating it are not scarce, as we learn from the Fathers. Josephus himself, after relating the narrative in his Antiquities, as if he felt that he had told an incredible and very foolish story, and was in danger of losing caste among the critics of the age, added by way of apology the words: "Now I have given the account about him as I found it written." Wherewith he set himself right in the eyes of his Gentile readers. St. Jerome refers to those who doubt the truth of the history. We give in

a note below his mode of arguing with them.\* We learn, also, from St. Augustine that from the earliest times of the acquaintances of the educated heathen with the Book of Jonah, they were in the habit of ridiculing it. He says: "Hoc enim genus quæstionis multo cachino a paganis, graviter irrisum animadvertenti . . . . . ex irrisione paganorum" (Epis. 49, Ques. 6.) Theodore, of Mopsuestia (c. 350—428 A. D.) states the same. Later Theophylact († 1100) informs us that the miracle of Jonah's being preserved alive three days and three nights in the belly of the fish "seemed incredible beyond measure to those who had gone forth from the schools of the Greeks, and were instructed in their philosophy" (Comm. in Jonam, c. II.)

Of this "multus cachinus," and irrisio paganorum," we have an excellent example in the "True Histories of Lucian of Samosata." In this satirical production, Lucian gives us a drastic *persiflage* of the Wonderful in the Book of Jonah. His travelers are on their way from the Morning Star, via the Moon, to Earth. They sailed in a ship adapted to air and ocean. On the fourth day they alighted gently on the calm sea. "When we touched the waters, it was wonderful how we were pleased and rejoiced beyond measure. We made a meal of what we had on hand; then casting loose the sails we went on as best we could, for there happened to be a calm, and the sea was quiet. Very frequently the beginning of greater evils is introduced by a change for the better; for having sailed along only two days upon the water, on the morning of the third day at sunrise, we suddenly saw a great many beasts and

---

\* Nec ignoro quosdam fore, quibus incredibile videatur tribus diebus ac noctibus in utero ceti, in quo naufragia dirigebantur, hominem potuisse servari; qui utique aut fideles erunt aut infideles: si fideles, multo majora credere cogentur: tunc come instances of these majora—youths in the fiery furnace, going through the Red Sea, Daniel and the lions. Sin autem infideles erunt, legant quindecim libros Nasonis Metamorphoses, et omnem Græcom, Latinamque historia, ubique cernent; vel Daphnen in laurum, vel Phœontis sorores in populos arbores fuisse conversas quomodo Jupiter eorum sublimissimus Deus sit mutatus in cygnum, in auro fluxerit, in tauro rapuerit, et cætera in quibus ipsa turpitudine fabularum divinitatis denegat sacritatem. Illis credunt, et dicunt Deo cuncta possibilia; et cum turpibus credant, potentiaque Dei universa defendant, eadem virtutem non tribuunt et honestis.—Comment. in Jonam, c. II. 2.



whales, all very large, but one particularly so, for it was fifteen hundred stadid (one hundred and seventy-two miles) in size. It came upon us yawning and shaking the sea violently; surrounded with foam, and showing teeth higher than the Phallus, pillars\* of which we spoke, all sharp as palisade-poles and white as ivory. We stood addressing each other for the last time, and embracing one another. And now it was upon us, and it drank us down, with the ship itself, at one swallow. Nor was it broken upon the teeth, for it fell in between the spaces. When we were in, at first it was dark, and we saw nothing; afterwards, when it opened its mouth we perceived a great cavity,—everywhere wide and high enough for a city of ten thousand people. Moreover, there were lying in it small fishes and many other animals, all cut up, and masts of vessels, and anchors, and bones of men, and merchandise. But in the middle was land and hills consolidated, as it seemed to me, from the mud and slime swallowed by the fish. Accordingly, there was a forest upon the hills, and all kinds of trees were growing and garden herbs had sprouted, and everything looked as if cultivated. The circumference of this piece of land was 240 stadia (twenty-seven miles); and there we could see sea-bird and gulls, and halcyons, hatching upon the trees. Then, indeed, we wept sorely; but afterwards, I having cheered up my companions, we underpropped the ship; and having struck fire with the fire-sticks, we prepared a meal of what we could get. Near by was abundance of flesh of all kinds of fishes, and we still had water from the Morning Star. On the following day, having started out, in the hope that the whale would gape, we saw now land and mountains, at another the heavens alone; frequently, we saw only islands, for the fish was rapidly carried about in all directions. We soon became accustomed to our new mode of life. So I took several of my companions, and went into the forest with the intention of examining everything. Before I had gone five stadia, I found a temple of Poseidon, as appeared from the inscription.

\* The Phalli here referred to are mentioned in Lucian's work, "On the Syrian Goddess." They were three hundred fathoms high. Vid. Lucian, V. H. I. 32 Schol.

Not long afterward I saw many tombs with tombstones upon them; near them was a fountain of very clear water. We also heard the barking of a dog, and saw smoke at a distance," &c., &c. Here the ancient Gulliver found a veracious Cyprian; they tell each other their various adventures. At the end of eight months our hero witnessed a wonderful sea-fight in perfect security from his station, between the animal's teeth. After this they set fire to the forest, and killed the whale, and so they escaped to behold equal wonders without.\* We only add the opinion pronounced upon this farrago by Schöll: Une véritable bambochade qui manque son effet parcequ'elle est trop chargée, (Litter. Grecque, Vol. 4.) Schiller, in his poem, "Die Götter Griechenland's, says)

"Einen zu bereichern unter allen,  
Müsste diese Götterwelt vergehen."

But we believe that here we have at least one instance where the literature of the classic world enriches itself with Jewish material. Dr. Bauer, of Tübingen, saw in Jonah another form of *Oannes*, a sea-monster, who taught civilization to the Babylonians—a wild venture. But the story of Jonah does seem to have influenced the myths of Greece to some extent. (1.) Hercules, when on the expedition to obtain the Golden Fleece, coasted along the Phrygian shore. There he found Hesione, a daughter of Laomedon, king of Troy, exposed to be devoured by a monster of the sea, like Andromeda in Ethiopia. This monster had devastated the land of Troy, and the king's daughter was offered to him as a propitiation. Hercules slew him, rescued her, and was to receive her as his bride. She was, however, withheld from him; in return for this insult, the hero destroyed Troy. This is the ancient version of the narrative as given by Homer (Il. 20, 145; 21, 441); Diodorus Siculus, a cotemporary of our Saviour (442); Apollodorus (2, 5, 9); Strabo (13, 1, 32). But Lycophron, B.C. 125, introduces another element into the simple form of the myths. He says that Hercu-

\* In the same work of Lucian's, we find him pouring out the vials of skeptic ridicule upon other sacred facts and ideas. Especially does he unmistakably refer to the Heavenly Jerusalem of the Revelation. V. H. II., ii. sqq.

les sprang into the jaws of the fish. Christian scholastics have (probably) added the clause "and returned after three days and three nights." \* A similar statement holds good, of the myth of Andromeda and Perseus. The oldest form of this story, as is known from the lost plays on this subject, by Sophocles and Euripides, and from Apollodorus, places the adventure on the shore of Ethiopia. Only a later tradition, and that, one which originated on *this very coast*, according to Pausanias, refers it to the shore of Philistia, at Joppa. Strabo remarks that this change in the geography of the myth is not sufficiently accounted for by *ignorance* (1, 2, 35). "Some again would transport Ethiopia into our Philistia, and make Joppa the scene of the adventures of Andromeda; and this not from any ignorance of the topography, but by a kind of mythic fiction." It is an ascertained fact that here on the coast of Joppa, there was no dearth of wild traditions of the sea, and stories of the marvellous. The sailor is everywhere the most superstitious man in the world—so much so, that there is scarcely a sailing-ship's crew that will knowingly transport a corpse across the Atlantic. What Strabo could not explain we can; we believe that it was only an attempt of the Phœnicians to gain possession of the Perseus myth; to this end they put it in connection with a story well-known to have occurred among themselves,—the story of Jonah.

We have seen above that Josephus added a saving clause to his reproduction of the contents of the book before us. We are not prepared to say, however, that his own relation to it was so negative as might appear at first view. Still, a Jew who could glory in the triumph of the Romans over Jerusalem might not be too good to renounce the belief of his fathers in this, and in similar cases. But proofs are not wanting of the high value set upon this book by the Jewish people. "It passed among them for unquestionable history. It was one of their most prized treasures. Tobit tells his son to "go into Media,

---

\* In his "Cassandra," which, however, Niebuhr refers to the second century of the Christian Era.

for I surely believe those things that Jonah spake of Nineveh." (Tobit xiv. 4, 8, cf. III Mac. 6, 8). To some of the Jewish fathers its symbolical meaning was not unknown. The Cabalists considered the book of Jonah as teaching the resurrection of the body; while the Talmud looks upon the Prophet as a type of the suffering Messiah. One Rabbi, however, Abarbanel (15th cen.) has given an interpretation which may be regarded as the forerunner of the views of the work now prevalent. He thought that Jonah *dreamed*, as he lay asleep in the ship, that he had been cast out and wonderfully rescued. This refutes itself. As literary curiosities we add the opinion of Clericus, who thought that Jonah was picked up by a *ship* whose *sign-head* was a whale; of Anton, who shrewdly suspected that the prophet found safety *on* the belly of a fish; and of v. d. Hardt who thought the story an allegorical statement of the leading events in the life of the Jewish king Manasseh. Of these, but not of these alone, we may say what Jerome said of some who had preceded him. Scio veteres ecclesiasticos tam Græcos quam Latinus super hoc libro multa dixisse, et tantis quæstionibus non tam apperuisse quam obscurasse sententias; ut ipsa interpretatio eorum opus habeat interpretatione, et multo incertior lector recedat quam fuerat antequam legeret. (Prol. in Jonam.)

A survey of the almost innumerable opinions held in regard to this portion of the Old Testament Canon shows us that from the earliest times down to the middle of the last century the writers of the Jewish and Christian Churches, with the exception of the Deists in England and of some isolated views, unanimously held fast the facticity of the events recorded in this book. Even those Jewish doctors who penetrating beneath the surface, saw the mysteries of the Messiah and of the future life, are no exceptions to this statement. The various views which have arisen since the days of Semler, the father of German Rationalism, so far as they deviate from the ancient view may be reduced to two classes, viz.: those which regard the contents of the Book of Jonah as a *myth*, and those that look upon it as a *tradition*. The latter counts more adherents

than the former. The myth theory compares the stories of Hercules, &c., and asserts that the Jonah-story is a variation of some such, or at least, if independent, that it belongs to the same class. The more popular view (Knobel, Bleek, Ewald, Stanley, *Hengstenberg*) holds that the narrative rests on some historical basis, which, however, cannot now be determined. Some tradition of the Prophet Jonah floating about through the Jewish world was finally seized by some man of God and wrought into its present form, and thus made to become the bearer of ideas which filled his own soul and which he wished to impress upon the hearts of his fellow-believers. We will let Heinrich Ewald state this mode of view." We have often seen how much the prophetic writers report of their own experience whether fully or merely by hints; so that every larger work of a prophet is at the same time the best picture of his life. But in every case that which a prophet wrote of himself was assuredly only a small portion of all that he lived to see, or of what his cotemporaries reported of him, for the life of an ancient prophet found its aim continually in the full light of publicity, and in the most stirring popular life. Besides the elder prophets wrote little or nothing. Accordingly it is self-evident that a great mass of real narratives about the prophets would gradually accumulate, shape and re-shape themselves, would be preserved through many generations, and might wander through many ages and changes, just as well as other popular stories. Such a story of a prophet (*Prophetensage*) could, in the same spirit in which it arose, *i. e.* with prophetic thoughts, be reanimated, and worked over with such freedom that it could still serve a writer as susceptible material for the statement of his own thoughts and propositions. Such as we would say, novel-like treatment of old traditions is to be found in the decadence of every independent literature. Compare the Indian *Kathasasit sâgara* and *The Arabian Nights*. The ancient Hebrew literature is distinguished from every other not in form, but in content and in higher, prophetic tendency. In the age when prophecy irrecoverably approached its decay, there were incontestably among the Jews a great

multitude of such traditions, which came the more into the foreground in proportion as the living prophetic activity grew less. We may suppose that this abundance would provoke collection and classification, but at the same time many of the mightily excited prophetic truths wrought so enduringly that they endeavored to exhaust themselves in the re-animation and reformation of these traditions, and so the last prophets themselves could become the authors of this youngest sprout of the prophetic literature. We have in the book of Jonah a tolerably early, and at the same time a very excellent example of this mode of treatment."

Ewald then proceeds to deduce the truth deposited in the book. It is this, that fear and penitence alone obtain salvation from the Lord, illustrated in the case of the seamen, of Jonah, and of the Ninevites. After the threefold confirmation of the same truth in the most diverse classes of men, rude sailors, Jonah, the prophet of the Lord, and the thousands of luxurious Ninevites, the author seeks in c. iv. to set forth the profound truth that the all-embracing love of God is the last and deepest ground of His acceptance of the penitence of men. Such is the leading truth to be set forth in Jonah; besides, it teaches how the genuine prophet of Jehovah must not be; that all men of all callings and of all nations are on a level before God's love. Such is Ewald's conception of the aim of this book. Of course, there is but little unity in his views of the book. But his mode of treatment does not imperatively demand it. Nor would perhaps any other expositor of the same class agree with him in the statement of the object and age of the book. When once we come to see that the real ground of these writers' departure from the ancient view of the book, does not rest so much in History, nor Philology as in a certain intolerance of the Miraculous which belongs to all who deny the primary fact of a divine revelation to man, the argument which influences *them* loses much of its edge for us. From the theistic stand-point, we see nothing impossible in the preservation of Jonah as narrated in the book bearing his name. Rather we would expect that something should occur of a kind

to serve as a symbol of Him whom the grave held for three days, and whom it could hold no longer. We confess that so far as the polemic against the historical credibility of this book is carried on, upon the basis of an unethical, pantheistical view of the world, we have no sympathy with it. At the same time the result may be at least partially true.

There are questions connected with the problem which have not yet been solved. It seems to us that the book could not have been written until after the close of the whole prophetic period, *i. e.* until after the return from the exile to Babylon. The argumentum *e silentio* that no mention is made by any subsequent prophet of such a fact as the repentance and conversion of Nineveh, a fact that would have told as powerfully in their plea against their obdurate cotemporaries as it did against the unbelieving generation of the Saviour's age, is conclusive so far as such an argument can be. Bleek (*Ein. in A. T.* p. 573) urges the improbability of a general conversion. That however is not decisive, for Jonah came accredited by a wonderful miracle. But that the conversion should have been so fruitless as to leave no confessors of the religion; that Jonah should have been able to demean himself so where there were those whom he should have instructed and made proselytes, is a contradiction of the spirit of the Old Testament in its relation to those who seek to come within its pale. Certain it is that the conversion made no impression. Certain it is that less than one hundred years after, the Assyrians, though speaking a kindred language with the Jews, were miserable idolators, relying proudly on their own gods and despising the deities of all other nations, the Lord Jehovah not excepted (*Is. xxxvii. 10* seq. v. 23 seq.) And accordingly we find later prophets than Jonah uttering the most fearful denunciations, not only against the Assyrian power in general, but against *Nineveh*. So Isaiah, Nahum, whose whole oracle refers to *Nineveh*, and Zephaniah. If these holy men had known that in former times a Hebrew prophet had preached there with such astounding success, would they not have alluded to him and held up to the objects of their denunciations, the good example of their own ancestors? Con-



trary to the historical character of the work is the fact that the name of the king in Nineveh is not mentioned,—for good reason as we shall presently show. In connection with these difficulties may be mentioned the omission of definite information as to the locality of the prophet's landing, the improbability of his composing a hymn in the fish's belly; and especially the fact that he represents his rescue from the waters into the whale as a *completed* salvation; for really chapter ii. is no prayer for aid but a thanksgiving for what was as yet not accomplished. Of course none of these objections taken alone carries with it a convincing power, but they all have taken together, an accumulative evidence truly great. There is one point which yet remains to be touched upon, viz.: the bearing which Assyrian history may exert upon the decision of the facticity of the statements of this book. In profane history we read of Ninus, who founded the old Assyrian Empire. Ninus is a myth, as is now allowed by all who have studied the subject. We turn to the Bible; the oldest notice we have that *can* be put in connection with the Assyrian empire, is in Gen. x. 8-12. Nimrod, however, there mentioned, stands connected not with Assyria, but with Babylonia, where Birs Nimrod is still the most striking object in all south Mesopotamia. From Babylonia he went out to "Asshur" (for thus we translate) and founded cities, among which Ninevah is mentioned. This, of course, is too indefinite to serve to determine anything with precision. We hear no more of Assyria until 770-760 B. C.—after Jonah's death. Recent investigations in the Orient may help us here. The oldest empire in this part of the world, of which history tells us, is the Babylonian. Gradually it extended northward, until we know that it took in at least the city of Asshur, now Kileh-Sherghat, west of the Tigris and sixty miles south of Nineveh. Whether the Babylonian empire included the district in which Nineveh stood is uncertain—probably it did. At Asshur (Kileh-Sherghat) have been found bricks and fragments of vases apparently bearing the names and titles of the earliest known Assyrian kings, and also pottery inscribed with the names of satraps who seemed to have ruled the country during the period

of the Babylonian ascendancy. It was probably the capital during the whole of that period, *i. e.* B. C. 2234-1273. The Assyrian empire commenced about 1273 B. C. Its earliest known king is a certain Bel-lush, who is the first of a series of four monarchs, proved by the bricks of Kileh-Sherghat to have borne sway in Assyria at a time when its connection with Babylonia had not long ceased, 1273-1200 B. C. No annals of the reign of Bel-lush have come down to us. "These kings," says Rawlinson, "are known by their legends upon bricks and vases which have been found at but one single place, viz.: Kileh Sherghat, and which are remarkable for nothing but the archaic type of the writing, and the intermixture of early Babylonian forms with others which are purely Assyrian." We next find a dynasty of six kings reigning from 1200-1050 B. C. These also reigned at Asshur. We read of their repairing the great temple of Anu and Val in that place. There a break occurs in the series of rulers. Asshur-iddin-akhi, the next known king, is thought to have ascended the throne about 1050 B. C., being thus a cotemporary of David. He is only known as the repairer of certain buildings at Kileh-Sherghat. Tiguti Ninip, the last monarch of the Kileh-Sherghat series was succeeded by his son Asshur-idani-pal (Sardanapalus), who appears to have transferred the seat of empire from Kileh-Sherghat to *Calah*, the modern Nimrod, a position about forty miles further to the north, near the junction of the greater Zab, with the Tigris, on the east bank of the stream. This monarch, the Sardanapalus of the Greeks, was a great conqueror; he calls himself "the conqueror from the upper passage of the Tigris to Lebanon and the Great Sea (Mediterranean,) who has reduced under his authority all countries from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof." Among others Eth-baal, king of the Sidonians and father of the infamous Jezebel, paid him tribute. Interesting as it is, we cannot follow up the history of this monarch; we only add that the sculptures of the great palace he founded at Calah (Nimrud) have been providentially preserved to the present day and constitute the greater portion of those now in the British Museum. Shalmanezar,

his son, succeeded him. The monuments of his reign record three campaigns against Syria now ruled by Benhadad, the enemy of Ahab and Jehoram, (1 Kings xx. 22; 2 Kings vi. 24). In a fourth campaign in which he compelled Hazael, the cruel oppressor of the Ten Tribes, (2 Kings viii. 28, &c.), to furnish him with provisions, the Assyrian empire first came into contact with the kingdom of Israel. One of the inscriptions records the tribute of Yahua, the son of Khumri, *i. e.* Jehu, the son of Omri; consisting of gold and silver and articles of gold. Shalmanezer dwelt both at Calah and at Nineveh; the former city he greatly embellished; he reigned from about 900—850 B. C., thus to within twenty-five years of Jonah. The following century, the one in the early part of which Jonah's mission must be laid, is occupied by only two royal names, the son and grandson of Shalmanezer; we find the latter building chambers at Nimrud (Calah) slabs of which, now in the British Museum testify that he received tribute from *Khumri*, Tyre, Sidon, Darnascus, Idumea and Palestine on the western sea. This monarch's name is *Val-lush*, and he is no doubt the *Pul* who reduced Menahem (2 K. xv. 19) to vassalage. With him the first great Assyrian dynasty closes, B. C. 747. This period is decidedly later than that of Jonah; but let us trace the thread of Assyrian history a little further before we draw our conclusion. How Tiglath Pileser, the successor of Pul, obtained the throne of Assyria is not known. He reigned at Nimrud; but few traces of his records remain, they having been intentionally defaced by his successors. His relations to the kingdoms of Judah and Israel are well known from the Holy Scriptures, and are confirmed by such monuments as yet remain of his reign. Of his successor, Shalmanezer II, little is known; he reigned at Nimrud. *Sargon*, who followed him, was a usurper, and begins a new dynasty embracing the famous names of Sennacherib and Esarhaddon. He removed the capital from Calah (Nimrud) to Nineveh about B. C. 712. He repaired the wall and built a great palace near to Nineveh, *viz.* at *Khorsabad*, fifteen miles north-east of *Koyunjik*, the true Nineveh. Sargon's

slabs have been found at Calah and at Nineveh, but chiefly at *Khorsabad*; they are in the Louvre at Paris.

But it was Sennacherib, his successor, who elevated Nineveh into the dignity of the royal city. The town had fallen into a state of extreme decay, partly from the ravages of time, partly from the swelling of the Tigris, and required a complete restoration to be fitted for a royal residence. He began the work in the second year of his reign. He collected a vast host of laborers from Chaldea, Syria, Cilicia and Armenia; 360,000 men wrought at his palace at Nineveh. Two years completed the work of the palace, and Nineveh was made "as splendid as the sun." Such was the Nineveh of B. C., 680, the city which floated before the vision of the author of the Book of Jonah. "Now it *was* an exceedingly great city of three days' journey," C. iii. 3. But we have seen that the Nineveh of 825, B. C., was an almost unknown place, such as never could have suggested the use made of it in our book, and was no capital at all. In the face of these reasons, and their accumulative power is very great, we do not see how we dare insist upon the historicalness of the events of the Book of Jonah, as they now come to us. It must have been written after the rise of Nineveh to the dignity of a royal city; and most probably after its destruction in 625, B. C. We are thus led to infer that the aim of this book is not historical at all, but rather that it was meant by the author to teach his countrymen some one or all of the lessons found in it, *e. g.*, by Ewald. To settle this point now is no pressing necessity, and we shall not enter upon it.

Our Blessed Lord bases upon this Old Testament book one of the severest reproofs He ever gave to His Pharisaic enemies. "An unbelieving generation demands of me a *sign*. As Jonah was saved by a miracle three days and three nights in the belly of the great fish, and thereby became a sign to the heathen city of Nineveh in which they believed and repented, so this generation of the chosen people, earthly-minded and no better than pagans, asking a sign from heaven, shall only receive one from the belly of the earth, of which Jonah's sign was a type, *viz.*, my death, sojourn in the grave, and in Hades (Eph. iv. 9),

"and my resurrection"; Matt. xii. 39; xvi. 4; Luke xi. 29-32. There is a parallel implied between the Jews of the Saviour's age and the people of Nineveh, as well as between Himself and Jonah. But when Neander and others make the tertium comparationis to consist in the preaching or mission, they both contradict St. Matthew's interpretation, and weaken the meaning. For all, to whom the Saviour is King in the realm of the True as well as of the Good, no additional pledge can be needed that the statements of the book of Jonah are founded upon facts: while on the other hand, in view of the laws which rule all human development (not the sinful alone), we cannot see in such use of this book by our Lord, the absolute guarantee that everything happened as described. The Saviour was a *man*; He lived under the laws of humanity, not indeed of the sin-cursed, but still, of humanity in all its limitedness. He did not know the time fixed for the Last Day: He did not know but what the cup might pass undrained from Him after having tasted of its bitterness all His life previous: He did not recognize the tempting Satan in the wilderness till He unmasked himself in His third demand: He did not know that He Himself was the destined Messiah till the Spirit of the Messianic office came upon Him at His baptism. He was no mathematician; but *had He applied the glorious powers of His perfect humanity* to the problem of the Geometers, or to the mechanism of the starry heavens, He would have accomplished the utmost possible to the finite. He was no historian: He did not know who built Pekin or who first colonized America: but had He become the historian of His people, we should now bathe in the light of the fully developed truth of Old Testament history, while now we catch but here and there a ray with pains and great uncertainty. There was here the *πλερῶμα* of all human powers, but it was not His office to apply it to all the departments of human thought, but to the work of His historical vocation. Hence we cannot feel at liberty to determine, solely upon the fact that Jésus of Nazareth so used the narrative of Jonah as He did, that all the particulars as to place, date, mode, *etc.*, are to be received as unquestioned history, under penalty of our not keeping the Faith. Hence we

believe that Jonah did receive an unusual commission which he wished to prove untrue, that he met with a miraculous deliverance; that he preached to some city, which may have been Nineveh, only not the Nineveh of the Book of Jonah, with great success; and that the words of Christ, resting on history will some day themselves become history.

---

#### ART. XI.—RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

---

*English, Past and Present. Eight Lectures.* By RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, D. D., *Archbishop of Dublin. Seventh Edition, Revised and Improved.* New York: Charles Scribner and Company. 1871.

A RICH treat is presented in this volume, and the publishers have done their part well to have it presented in a worthy style. Those who are acquainted with "Trench on the Study of Words," will know pretty well the character of this book. It was prepared at a later period, comprises 350 pages, and contains eight lectures on the following subjects: I. The English Vocabulary, II. English as it might have been, III. Gains of the English Language, IV. The same continued, V. Diminutions of the English Language, VI. The same continued, VII. Changes in the Meaning of English Words, VIII. Changes in the Spelling of English Words.

For any one who may not be acquainted with the Author's former little work, a specimen or two from this may be interesting. Take the following: "Gossip" is a word in point. This name is given by our Hampshire peasantry to the sponsors in baptism, the god-fathers and godmothers. We have here a perfectly correct employment of 'gossip,' in fact its proper and original one, one involving moreover, a very curious record of past beliefs. 'Gossip,' or 'gossib' as Chaucer spelt it, is a compound word, made up of the name of 'God,' and of an old Anglo Saxon word 'sib,' still alive in Scotland, as all readers of Walter Scott will remember, and in some parts of England, and which means, akin; they being 'sib,' who are related to one another. But why, you may ask, was the name given to sponsors? Out of this reason:—in the Middle Ages it was the prevailing belief (and the Romish Church still affirms it), that those who stood as sponsors to the same child, besides contracting spiritual obligations on behalf of that child, also contracted spiritual affinity one with another; they became *sib*, or

akin, in *God*, and thus 'gossips,' hence 'gossiped,' an old word exactly analogous to 'kindred.' Out of this faith the Roman Catholic Church will not allow (unless by dispensation), those who have stood as sponsors to the same child, afterwards to contract marriage with one another, affirming them too nearly related for this to be lawful. Take 'gossip,' however, in its ordinary present use, as one addicted to idle tittle-tattle, and it seems to bear no relation whatever to its etymology and first meaning. The same three steps, however, which we have traced before will bring us to its present use. 'Gossips' are, first, the sponsors, brought by the act of a common sponsorship into affinity and near familiarity with one another; secondly, these sponsors, who being thus brought together, allow themselves with one another in familiar, and then in trivial and idle talk; thirdly, they are any who allow themselves in this trivial and idle talk, called in French '*commérage*,' from the fact that '*commère*' has run through exactly the same stages as its English equivalent."

Those fond of the rich dish called *Welsh-rabbit* will here learn, that it used to be called *Welsh rarebit*; that the word 'religion,' in the well-known statement of St. James, signified when our version was made, just what the original *θρησκεία* signifies, the *external service* of God—that the 'take no thought' in Matt. vi. 25, means no *painful solicitude*, which *thought* was used to express at that time, which corresponds also to the original—that the *kindly* fruits of the earth are the *natural* fruits of the earth, &c., &c.

*Ad Fidem, or Parish Evidences of the Bible.* By REV. E. F. BURR, D. D., *Author of Ecce Cælum,* &c. Boston: Noyes, Holmes and Company, No. 117 Washington Street. 1871.

This book deals mainly with preliminary inquiries in regard to what are called "The Evidences of Christianity." Its aim is to remove difficulties from the way of all who have not yet come to look at Christianity directly, and to lead them to faith in it. The style is vigorous, lucid, and direct. We think the author confounds the *Bible* too much with Christianity. He speaks of Bible-religion where we would prefer the words Christian religion. So he also seems to overlook the Church as of any significance in conducting his inquiry and argument.

*Gutenberg, and the Art of Printing.* By EMILY C. PEARSON. Boston: Noyes, Holmes and Company, 117 Washington Street. 1871.

An interesting and graphic history of the invention of the art of printing. It takes the reader to Rhineland, which is at once ancient and modern, where are "ruins of the Middle Ages, and marks of the French Revolution; the bones of great feudal giants, and



scars of modern disturbances." Recent events have thrown a new interest around the historic places of this region, especially around Strasbourg. It is a book of interest for all, especially for the young.

*Wonderful Escapes. Revised from the French of F. Bernard, and Original Chapters added.* By RICHARD WHITING. With twenty-six Plates. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1871.

*The Wonders of Engraving.* By GEORGES DUPLESSIS. Illustrated with Thirty-four Engravings. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1871.

These additional volumes keep up the interest of this Library of Wonders, which has been so favorably received by the public. They are of uniform style, and convey much useful information.

The above volumes are also to be had from Smith, English & Co., a Publishing House familiar to the readers of this Review.

*The Observer Year-Book, 1871.* SIDNEY E. MORSE, JR., and Company, 37 Park Row.

This volume of two hundred pages contains a great mass of valuable information, and is useful for reference. The price is one dollar. It contains both secular and religious information—gives lists of all the Theological Seminaries and Colleges in the United States, of all the ministers in the leading denominations, and such other statistics as one may not be able to find either in a library of ordinary books, or even in the Encyclopedias.

*Book of Worship, Published by the General Synod of the Lutheran Church in the United States.* Philadelphia: Lutheran Board of Publication. Baltimore: T. Newton Kurtz. 1871.

The need of a suitable Order of Worship, to take the place of much disorder that has found entrance into the service of the sanctuary, has led this section of the Lutheran Church to follow in the wake of the other wing of the same Church, in preparing this Book of Worship. The liturgical movement in the Lutheran Church is following pretty much the same course, in which this movement has gone forward in the Reformed Church. This Book is only a beginning in the work, and does not compare with the excellent Liturgy published under direction of the General Council of the Lutheran Church. It contains only a Morning and an Evening Service for the worship of the Lord's-Day. It is rather a Hymn-Book than a Liturgy. Yet it is a respectable beginning in the right direction. The order for the Lord's-Day service opens with the usual sentence, "In the name of the Father, and of the

Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen." Then follow sentences from the Scriptures, the Gloria Patri, Confession of Sin, The Apostles' Creed, Gloria in Excelsis, Reading of the Scriptures, Hymn, Prayer, Hymn, Sermon, Closing Prayer (Lord's Prayer), Hymn, Benediction. We notice that the leading periodical of this portion of the Lutheran Church is engaged in removing the prejudices that have crept in against the use of liturgical service. The same errors are found to prevail among them that we have had to contend against in the Reformed Church. We congratulate the Lutheran Church in entering upon this movement. When once the Lutheran and the Reformed Church have taken their stand fully and unequivocally on their true historical position, and cast off the foreign spirit that has come in, there will be a prospect that these twin-sisters of the Reformation may come nearer together, and if not organically united, at least join their influence in holding up the true Reformation standard. There is no valid reason why they should not feel called to work together as the representatives of the Reformation Church of the Fatherland in the New World. Both have developed two tendencies, the one to stand fully on the historical position of the Reformation, the other towards Puritanism. The liturgical movement is gaining strength rapidly in both denominations. There is no longer a question as to liturgical worship as such, but only as to the character of the liturgy. We rejoice in this evidence of progress towards a *true* as well as *spiritual* Order of Worship.

*Books and Reading; or What Books shall I Read, and How shall I Read Them?* BY NOAH PORTER, D.D., LL.D., Professor in Yale College. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1871.

We had read something of what this book contains before it appeared in its present form. We were pleased with what we read then,—we are still better pleased with the manner in which the whole subject is handled in this volume. It has been said that it requires gold to work a gold mine. In like manner it seems to be necessary to read a *book* in order to learn how to read *books*. It is true of readers generally, that they need at some time or other a guide to lead them to give people direction to their reading and turn it to proper account. It is especially important, that those, who aim to be scholars, should have such a guide. We could wish that this book of Prof. Porter's had been made to bear somewhat on the case of students. They especially need direction in the beginning of their course of reading to begin at the right place. There is a chapter on the Criticism of Literature, but we think a chapter on Literature itself would have been an addition to the value of the book. Prof. Porter is an educator of established reputation, and he writes in the best English style.